



University
of Glasgow

Soderlund, Sven Kenneth (1978) *The oracles against the Philistines and Edom in the Greek text of Jeremiah: chapter 29 as a microcosm of the problems presented by the Septuagint version of Jeremiah*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1738/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

TILL MIN MOR

TILL MINNET AV MIN FAR

THE ORACLES AGAINST THE PHILISTINES AND EDM
IN THE GREEK TEXT OF JEREMIAH:
CHAPTER 29 AS A MICROCOSM OF THE PROBLEMS PRESENTED
BY THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF JEREMIAH

BY

SVEN KENNETH SODERLUND

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW,
FACULTY OF DIVINITY, FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

AUGUST, 1978

C O N T E N T S

PREFACE

ABSTRACT

ABBREVIATIONS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY

1

CHAPTER 2

THE TEXT-CRITICAL PROBLEM (1): AN INDUCTIVE STUDY
OF THE MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE FOR LXX JEREMIAH 29

15

I. Description of the Evidence

15

II. Collation of the Evidence

22

III. Grouping of the Evidence

55

A. The O Group (or Hexaplaric Recension)

55

B. The L Group (or Lucianic Recension)

74

C. The C Group (or Catena Text)

91

D. The Q Group

96

E. The A Group

105

F. The B Group

109

CHAPTER 3

THE TEXT-CRITICAL PROBLEM (2): A CRITIQUE OF
J. ZIEGLER'S CRITICAL EDITION OF JEREMIAH

114

I. Critique of Ziegler's First Apparatus

115

II. Critique of Ziegler's Second Apparatus

134

III. Critique of Ziegler's Reconstructed Text

143

CHAPTER 4

THE TRANSLATOR/REVISER PROBLEM: A CRITIQUE OF E. TOV'S CHALLENGE TO THE MULTIPLE TRANSLATOR THEORY FOR THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH	174
I. Similarities Between Jer a' and b'	176
II. Differences Between Jer a' and b'	189
III. Conclusions	207

CHAPTER 5

THE GREEK/HEBREW PROBLEM: A CRITIQUE OF J. GERALD JANZEN'S STUDY OF THE RELATION- SHIP BETWEEN THE TWO TEXTS OF JEREMIAH	215
I. Critique of Janzen's "Introduction"	216
II. Critique of Janzen's Explanation of the "Zero Variants" in the Oracles Against the Philistines and Edom	225
III. Conclusions	277

NOTES	280
-------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	318
--------------	-----

PREFACE

Work on the present thesis commenced in the autumn of 1973 when I was awarded an Advanced Study Scholarship by the University of Glasgow for the purpose of pursuing research in the Department of Old Testament, Faculty of Divinity. I wish here to thank the stewards of that scholarship for the honour of coming to Glasgow and for supporting me and my family during three years of study in that city. Also I want to thank my supervisor, Professor Robert Davidson, who gave valuable advice in determining the direction of my research and who has been a constant source of encouragement.

Subsequent to our move to Teversham, Cambridge, and assuming the pastoral duties of a village church, I was kindly provided with a year's research grant by the Tyndale Fellowship, a considerable help. Others, too--family and friends in Canada, Sweden, and Britain--have contributed to making our stay in this country not only possible but enjoyable. To them we owe an incalculable debt of gratitude.

Many have helped in giving academic advice or in making available research material. I think particularly of the kindness shown to me by Professor Robert Hanhart and his staff at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen during my study visit in Göttingen in the summer of 1975. Dr Ian Moir of Edinburgh efficiently produced a computer concordance of the LXX of Jeremiah based on Rahlfs' text; Dr Robert P. Gordon of Glasgow and Professor David W. Gooding of Belfast have both read different parts of my work and offered expert advice. Friends at Tyndale House, Cambridge, have freely given of their time in proofreading and in other matters.

A special word of thank must go to my wife, Rose, who has stood with me and behind me during this period of research with unwavering loyalty. In addition to typing a large section of the thesis she has had the time and strength to give birth to

three lovely daughters. In the final stages of the typing I could not have done without the sacrificial help and time of my sister, Mary, who came over from Sweden specifically for the purpose. Finally, to my parents I owe more than I can say. To my mother, and to the memory of my father, I dedicate this work.

Teversham, Cambridge

August 28, 1978

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to make a detailed analysis of the two oracles against the Philistines and Edom in the Greek (LXX) text of Jeremiah with a view to highlighting three problem areas in that book. The three areas in question are the Greek text-critical problem, the translator/reviser problem, and the Greek/Hebrew problem. Each of these issues has recently been treated in specialized monographs covering their respective field for the entire LXX version of Jeremiah; they therefore serve as background for much of the discussion in the course of this thesis.

Chapter 1, or the "Introduction", deals with the background, objectives, and methodology of the undertaking. The chapter provides a brief review of past research in each of the areas covered, up to and including the contributions of J. Ziegler, E. Tov, and J.G. Janzen in their respective fields. Their works are then signalled out as the object of special critique in the body of the thesis. The methodology adopted for this critique is that of focusing attention on a specific passage which is tangent in significant ways to each of the problems posed. It is suggested that Jeremiah Chapter 29, consisting in the Greek text of the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, is a pivotal passage which provides the necessary platform for the proposed critique.

Chapters 2 and 3 are devoted to a consideration of the inner-Greek text-critical problem. In Chapter 2 the extant manuscript and indirect evidence to the original translation of the oracles against the Philistines and Edom is independently collated and evaluated. Employing the principles of the "group method", the chapter seeks to trace the transmission history of these oracles back to their best and earliest recoverable text form.

Chapter 3 employs the results obtained in the previous chapter for the purposes of evaluating the text-critical principles and accuracy of J. Ziegler's edition of Jeremiah, volume 15 in the large series of LXX critical texts sponsored

by the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. The examination reveals a high level of technical competence and reliability in the execution of the task and in the presentation of the material; the attempt at a critically restored LXX archetype text is therefore fully vindicated. A more debatable point has to do with the incorporation of conjectured emendations into the body of the text, a subject which is given extended discussion in the concluding section of the chapter.

Chapter 4 takes up the question of the translator/reviser problem. According to a published work by E. Tov, Chapters 29-52 of the LXX version of Jeremiah represent not the original translation of the book but a later revision of it. This theory is advanced against that of H. St. J. Thackeray who, earlier in the century, had proposed a multiple translator theory to account for the lexical phenomena of the book. Our analysis shows that, while Tov has made an interesting case for the reviser theory, he has not successfully undermined the more natural interpretation of the evidence embodied in the two translator theory.

In the final chapter consideration is given to the Greek/Hebrew problem as it is reflected in the study of J.G. Janzen. According to Janzen's understanding of the relationship between the shorter Greek text and the longer Hebrew text, this divergence is due almost entirely to secondary expansion in the Hebrew rather than translator abridgement in the Greek. However, the present investigation fails to bear out this generalization on the scale with which it is advanced. On the contrary, the chapter contends that in Janzen's work insufficient notice has been taken of translator responsibility in the Greek and too much has been attributed to scribal expansion in the Hebrew. It is further argued that, even in such places where it seems likely that the translator worked from a Hebrew text shorter than that of the standard Massoretic text, it cannot everywhere be assumed that the shorter reading is necessarily the better reading. The question of priority of reading still has to be weighed case by case.

ABBREVIATIONS

AASF	<u>Annales academiae scientiarum Fennicae</u>
AJA	<u>American Journal of Archaeology</u>
AS	<u>Anatolian Studies</u>
Bagster	<u>The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament</u> London, n.d.
BANE	<u>The Bible and the Ancient Near East</u> , ed. G.W. Wright, London, 1961
BASOR	<u>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Studies</u>
BHK	<u>Biblia Hebraica</u> , ed. R. Kittel, ³ 1937
BHS	<u>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u> , ed. K. Elliger, 1964-74
BK	<u>Biblischer Kommentar</u>
BM	Brooke, A.E. and McLean, N., <u>The Old Testament in Greek</u> , Cambridge, 1906-40
BZAW	<u>Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
CBQ	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
CCL	<u>Corpus Christianorum</u> , Series Latina
CHB	<u>Cambridge History of the Bible</u>
DJD	<u>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan</u>
EB	<u>Encyclopaedia Biblica</u> , London, 1899
FSAC	Albright, W.F., <u>From Stone Age to Christianity</u> , 1957
GGA	<u>Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen</u>
GK	Gesenius-Kautzsh, <u>Hebrew Grammar</u> , Oxford, 1910
HAT	<u>Handbuch zum Alten Testament</u>
HJ	<u>Heythrop Journal</u>
HP	Holmes, R. and Parsons, J., <u>Vetus Testamentum Graecum</u> , Oxford, 1798-1827
HR	Hatch, E. and Redpath, H.A., <u>A Concordance to the Septuagint</u> , Oxford, 1897

HSDB	(Hastings Shorter) <u>Dictionary of the Bible</u> , Edinburgh, ² 1963
HSM	<u>Harvard Semitic Monographs</u>
HTR	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
IBD	<u>Interpreter's Bible Dictionary</u>
IEJ	<u>Israel Exploration Journal</u>
IOSCS	International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
ISBE	<u>International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia</u>
JAOS	<u>Journal of the American Oriental Society</u>
JB	<u>The Jerusalem Bible</u> , 1966
JBL	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
JCS	<u>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</u>
JJS	<u>The Journal of Jewish Studies</u>
JSOT	<u>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</u>
JSS	<u>Journal of Semitic Studies</u>
JTS	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
LSJ	Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., and Jones, H.S., <u>Greek-English Lexicon</u> , Oxford, ⁹ 1940
MSU	<u>Mitteilungen des Septuginta-Unternehmens zu Göttingen</u>
NAWG	<u>Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen</u>
NEB	<u>The New English Bible</u> , 1970
NTS	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
OAN	Oracles Against the Nations = Jer Ch. 46-51
PG	Migne, <u>Patrologia Graeca</u>
PL	Migne, <u>Patrologia Latina</u>
QHBT	<u>Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text</u> , eds. Cross, F.M. and Talmon, S.
RB	<u>Revue Biblique</u>
RivStor- LettRel	<u>Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa</u>

RSV	Revised Standard Version, 1946
RV	Revised Version, 1881
SMS	Jellicoe, S., <u>The Septuagint of Modern Studies</u> , 1968
SupVT	<u>Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</u>
TLZ	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
TRe	<u>Theologische Revue</u>
TRu	<u>Theologische Rundschau</u>
TU	<u>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der alt-christlichen Literatur</u>
VT	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
ZAW	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY

Sometime in 587/6 B.C. following the destruction of Jerusalem a colony of Hebrew refugees settled in Egypt. Among the exiles was the prophet Jeremiah, who, against his will and advice had been forced to leave the land of his fathers. Once settled in Egypt, Jeremiah continued to prophesy to the end of his days, thus adding yet more to the already substantial body of written and oral tradition deriving from his ministry. Precisely how, when, where, and by whom this material, together with later additions, was edited to form what exists today as the Book of Jeremiah, is still a matter of debate. What is certain is that in the course of time this literature came to be accepted by the Jews as part of their sacred scripture and as such entered deep into the memory and national consciousness of the Jewish people.¹

Some three centuries following the events of 587/6 B.C., the Jewish community in Egypt--by this time of growing size and influence--was destined to initiate an undertaking of major significance for the later study and transmission of their sacred books. Forced by circumstances gradually to abandon their language, the Jews clung nonetheless tenaciously to their faith. The existence of the written Law in Hebrew only, however, made effective communication of their religion difficult. Thus it came about that, sometime in the first half of the third century B.C. in the cosmopolitan city of Alexandria, a pioneering attempt was made to render the Torah into the language of common currency, that of Hellenistic or Koine Greek. Following the translation of the Pentateuch (an event witnessed to by the otherwise largely legendary account of the Letter of Aristeas), the corpus of translated books, together with others composed originally in Greek, grew slowly over the next couple of centuries until by the time

of the Christian era something resembling the Greek Bible known today as the Septuagint was in existence.² The adoption by the Christian church of this literature as its scriptures was an event of the greatest significance not only for the doctrinal development of the daughter religion but also for the subsequent transmission history of the LXX itself.

Included among the translated corpus was of course the book of Jer. The few indications at our disposal suggest that it, together with the other prophetic books--Isaiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve--may have been among the first to follow the translation of the Pentateuch. A date somewhere between the middle of the third and second centuries B.C. may be thought reasonable for this book, preference being given to the upper rather than the lower limits within that period.³ The extant witnesses to the text of this book are to be found in Gk papyri and MSS, citations from early Jewish and Christian sources, and daughter versions of the LXX. Comparison of these sources raises interesting questions regarding the original text of the translation, for what we find in the available documents is a host of textual variants with only a rare case of uniform agreement among all the sources; indeed, in the minds of some, these variants have raised the question whether there ever was any such thing as an "original" translation at all.

The recognition of the problems posed by the existence of conflicting readings in different MSS is of no modern vintage. For the earliest observations on these matters we must again go back to the ancient city of Alexandria--so closely linked to the fortunes of the LXX--and particularly to the learned works of Origen, the greatest Christian biblical scholar of his day (d. A.D. 254/5). In the course of his numerous commentaries on the books of the Bible, Origen several times had occasion to remark on the presence of variant readings within the copies of his Gk MSS. An illuminating example of this is found in one of his homilies on Jer (xiv, 3) where, commenting on Jer 15:10 he encountered the phrase which in "the majority of MSS" (τοῖς πλείστοις τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις) read, "I have not helped, nor has

anyone helped me" (οὐκ ὠφέλησα, οὐδε ὠφέλησε με οὐδεὶς), but which "in the most accurate MSS and those which agree with the Hebrew" (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις καὶ συμφωνοῦσι τοῖς Ἑβραϊκοῖς) read "I have not lent on usury, neither has anyone lent to me on usury" (οὐκ ὠφείλησα οὐδε ὠφείλησέ με οὐδεὶς) (GCS, Origenes III, p. 107). In this homily Origen felt obliged to expound both versions, but when he returned to the same passage in the following homily (xv, 5), in the meantime having had a chance to study the matter more closely, he decided that the majority LXX reading was in fact the result of a scribal error (γραφικόν... ἁμάρτημα) (Origenes III, p. 129). Similarly, in commenting upon the Gk text of 16:18 (Homily xvi, 6), Origen notes that the word πρῶτον was missing in the LXX possibly by a lapse on the part of scribes or even by fault of the original translators.⁴ Other examples of a rudimentary sort of textual criticism applied to the LXX of Jer in early times may be found in the margins of some MSS and in the commentaries of certain of the patristic writers such as Jerome, Theodoret, and Olympiodorus.⁵

Effective use of the LXX, whether for understanding its own theology or for its use in the textual criticism of the Heb OT, demands first a coming to terms with the nature of the inner-Gk variants attested by the MSS and the recovery, as far as possible, of the earliest text to which the evidence points. Without this, as Paul de Lagarde said, other investigations and conclusions relating to the LXX "schweben in der Luft" (Anmerkungen, p. 2). Ch. 2 of the present thesis is devoted to this text-critical task as it relates to the oracles against the Philistines and Edom in LXX Jer 29. Employing the principles of the group method, the chapter seeks to identify the deliberate and accidental changes that have affected the text of these oracles in their transmission history and by a process of elimination works back to the best MS witnesses at our disposal for determining their earliest form.

A new phase in the text history of the LXX commenced with the invention of printing and the preparation of large editions

of the Gk OT. The story of the printed LXX begins in the sixteenth century with the Complutensian Polyglot (printed 1514-17, published 1520), the Aldine (1518) and Sixtine (1587) editions respectively, the latter of which--purportedly a faithful representation of Codex Vaticanus, but in reality an Aldine text revised according to the Vatican MS⁶--was destined to become a kind of textus receptus for generations of LXX readers, being reprinted either in unaltered or slightly revised form many times down to the present day. Following the famous sixteenth century editions of southern Europe, the next major LXX publication enterprises took place in England, where, between the years 1707-20, J.E. Grabe and collaborators produced an edited version of the oldest British MS at the time, Codex Alexandrinus, followed in 1798-1827 by the monumental edition of R. Holmes and J. Parsons containing a collation of nearly 300 Gk MSS, though the text itself was merely a reprint of the Sixtine. The discovery in the nineteenth century of the invaluable Codex Sinaiticus stimulated the production in Leipzig, Germany, of Tischendorf's seven editions of the LXX, 1850-87 (the last two edited by Eb. Nestle), which while again reprinting a (revised) Sixtine text, contained a useful apparatus of select variants from the main uncials, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Sinaiticus (or Codex Friderico-Augustanus as Tischendorf called it), and Codex Ephraemi.

Within the last century, however, the prosecution of text-critical research and publication of texts has come to be associated mainly with two academic centres, Cambridge and Göttingen. As early as 1875 F.H.A. Scrivener of Cambridge presented to the Syndics of the University Press a plan for the preparation of a major edition of the LXX, the execution of which was entrusted in 1883 to H.B. Swete and duly announced in the Cambridge University Reporter on 13 March of that year (p. 473). The notice stated that it was the intention of the Syndics of the press to publish "an edition of the Septuagint and Apocrypha with an ample apparatus criticus, intended to provide materials for the critical determination of the text" and that as a preliminary step they hoped to publish a "portable text" of the LXX, "taken from the Vatican MS where this is not defective, with variations of two or

three other early uncial MSS". This enterprise bore fruit in the publication between the years 1887-94 of the first edition of Swete's widely distributed three-volume manual work, The Old Testament in Greek (later several times revised and reprinted). When Dr. Swete was unable also to assume the responsibility for editing the larger edition--programmatic guidelines for this edition in the meantime having been worked out by F.J.A. Hort--this task was entrusted in 1895 to A.E. Brooke and N. McLean (later, in 1927, officially joined by H. St. J. Thackeray), and between the years 1906-40 approximately the first half of the LXX appeared in this eminent publishing venture.⁷

Meanwhile the Septuaginta-Unternehmen of Göttingen (an LXX research centre established there in 1908 by the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen under the leadership of Alfred Rahlfs) was proceeding with its own programme, but along different lines from those of Cambridge. Whereas the Cambridge approach was to collate the evidence on the basis of one MS (mainly Codex Vaticanus, or failing that, the nearest standing uncial), the reigning philosophy in Göttingen was to attempt a critically restored text through a comparison and grouping of all the sources. The inspiration for this project derived from the encyclopaedic scholar Paul de Lagarde who, in his work on the LXX, laboured hard to formulate the text-critical principles by which such a text might be constructed.⁸ Although one peculiar aspect of his methodology having to do with the prior preparation of the three ecclesiastical texts of Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius had to be abandoned, his successors nevertheless carried on with the preparation of prolegomena and editing of critical texts according to the general Richtlinien laid down by Lagarde. Just as Swete's text preceded the larger Cambridge edition, so a two-volume "Handausgabe" by Rahlfs, Septuaginta (1935), although a private undertaking and published in Stuttgart, demonstrated the Göttingen approach. The text is an eclectic one, determined on the basis of the three major uncials B, S, and A (sometimes along with a few other witnesses). Rahlfs was also the first to prepare texts for the larger Göttingen series, Genesis, (1926, also published

in Stuttgart, since then replaced by the edition of J.W. Wevers, 1975), and Psalmi cum Odis (1931). Under a variety of editors this series continues to appear, to date nearly half (mainly from the second half) of the LXX having been published.⁹

As for the text of Jer, this has appeared in all the editions mentioned so far, with the notable exception of the larger Cambridge series, which regrettably did not reach the section of the prophets before the project ceased. In addition, Jer has also appeared in two independent editions, the critical text of M.G. L. Spohn (1824)¹⁰ and that of Eb. Nestle (1924)¹¹ (both posthumously published by their sons). The former offers a unique reconstruction of the text drawing heavily on Hexaplaric material while the second represents something of a half-way stage between the Cambridge and Göttingen approaches since its base text reproduces essentially Codex Vaticanus (albeit corrected at a few points by other MS readings and even by a few conjectural emendations) but is accompanied by its own pioneering attempt at grouped readings in the apparatus.

Far and away the most important text of Jer produced hitherto is, however, volume 15 of the larger Göttingen series, Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae, 1957 (reprinted with slight alterations in 1976),¹² edited by Joseph Ziegler. Previously Ziegler had edited in the same series the texts of Isaiah (1939), the Twelve (1943), Ezekiel (1952), and Daniel (including Susanna and Bel and the Dragon, 1954), so that as the last of the prophetic books to be edited, the text of Jer enjoyed the advantage of hindsight and expertise gained in the execution of the earlier volumes. In addition to this text Ziegler also prepared an accompanying monograph, Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta (MSU 6, 1958), as well as two articles, "Die Septuaginta Hieronymi im Buch des Propheten Ieremias" (1952),¹³ and "Ieremias-Zitate in Väter-Schriften" (1958).¹⁴ In Ch. 3 of this thesis I hope to evaluate the success with which Ziegler has employed the available MS materials in the composition of his critical apparatuses and in the choice of readings in his restored text. I will be particularly interested in determining at each stage the text-critical

principles that underlie his work and in seeing how these principles have been applied to the restoration of the main text.

This sort of critique seems especially necessary in the case of the Göttingen texts since there persists in some quarters a crisis of doubt over the validity of a critically reconstructed LXX text. Here and there, both in verbal and written form, one meets with remarks about "the concoction of eclectic texts", a clear preference for the Cambridge one-MS approach being intended.¹⁵ Yet it is strange that one school should be so frequently pitted against the other as though they had in view two radically different objectives. This is manifestly false. The leading spirits in Cambridge no less than in Göttingen had as their ultimate objective a critically restored text. This is clear not only from their explicit statements on the subject,¹⁶ but also from the high esteem in which the Cambridge editors held Lagarde¹⁷ and his colleagues and the constant friendly exchange of MS and collation material that passed between the two centres. The difference between them lay not in ultimate objective but in the means of getting there. In Cambridge the attitude was constantly one of "Not yet",¹⁸ whereas in Göttingen the question was rather "Why not?" British policy was that all the data should first be collected in published form before being worked over by an editor in the preparation of a reconstructed text. In Göttingen it was believed the process of collating and editing could go hand in hand. Here lay the difference of approach.

My text-critical work on Jer has convinced me that the materials are at hand for an attempted reconstruction of the text so that for this book at least the Göttingen approach seems vindicated. It must also be said that the sum total of Ziegler's work on Jer is impressive indeed and represents a monumental step forward in the textual analysis of the Gk Jer. Yet, impressive as it is, it cannot be allowed to ring down the curtain on further scholarly inquiry into the textual problems of the book. As Peter Walters has well described it, the Göttingen project represents a "task for which there is neither end nor limit: that of an ever-increasing approximation to the supposed archetype

to which the evidence points" (Text, p. 10). In order that scholarship continue to advance, it is essential that even Ziegler's text be subjected to objective critique so that its merits may be fully appreciated as well as any weaknesses exposed. Apart from a few generalized reviews in the journals at the time of the publication of the text,¹⁹ to our knowledge this has not previously been undertaken.

But the text-critical question is not the only inner-Gk problem that the student of the LXX of Jer has to contend with. There is also what we have called the "translator-reviser" problem. Analysis of the text makes it clear that around the middle of the book--specifically in LXX Ch. 29--certain lexical differences begin to appear between the two halves of the book, the clearest example of which is the shift from the conventional form of the messenger formula $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ + nomen sacrum in the first half of the book to $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ + nomen sacrum in the second half.²⁰ Such peculiarities of the text and their implications for a plurality of translators in the book had been noticed by scholars working on the LXX of Jer already in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,²¹ but it was not till the first decades of this century that the matter received systematic treatment at the hands of the eminent Septuagintalist Henry St. John Thackeray. It was Thackeray who first noticed that the change in style and vocabulary takes place at a definite point in the book and who, on this basis, first produced a specific multiple translator theory to account for the observed phenomena.²²

Having "discovered" the multiple translator phenomenon in Jer, Thackeray himself extended the discussion to other books and found evidence for the same thing happening in Ezekiel and Reizns.²³ Other scholars followed him and in turn proposed a plurality of translators for the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, as well as other books,²⁴ so that by 1941 H. M. Orlinsky could write that this phase of LXX study already had a respectable bibliography.²⁵ But since the arguments used in some of these works were increasingly exposed to negative criticisms

and as new explanations for the observed phenomena were proposed on the basis of recently discovered recensions, enthusiasm for multiple translation theories waned proportionately.²⁶ Through the ebb and flow of popularity for such theories, however, the case for Jer--the book that originally sparked off the search for multiple translator explanations--seemed secure and was accepted as an established datum in most commentaries, introductions, biblical dictionaries and encyclopaedias.²⁷ Even Ziegler who had severely criticized the multiple translation theories for Isaiah and the Minor Prophets was much more impressed by the evidence for Jer and declared himself in basic agreement with Thackeray's observations, himself employing Thackeray's terminology of different translators.²⁸ However, in one short but important footnote in the Introduction to his Ieremias text (p. 128, n. 1), Ziegler entered a caveat on the interpretation of Thackeray's findings. In view of some of the remarkable agreements between the two halves of Jer, he suggested, it should be inquired whether the differences in the second half do not derive from a reviser rather than a second translator.

Evidently taking his cue from this footnote, Emanuel Tov has elaborated on Ziegler's suggestion in a thesis presented in 1973 to the University of Jerusalem and later published (in revised form) under the title The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8, 1976. In this thesis Tov has sought to defend the proposition that a translator-reviser theory better accounts for the lexical phenomena of the book of Jer than does a multiple translator theory, though his theory differs in certain respects from Ziegler's seminal suggestion. In Ch. 4 of the present thesis I shall explore the nature of this problem and seek to evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of Tov's counter-theory on the basis of data provided by the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, the point where a new hand evidently appears.

The inner-Gk problems of the LXX of Jer having to do with the establishment of the earliest recoverable text and the

intriguing translator-reviser issue are indeed complex and important. Yet it is not these matters that have attracted the most attention to the LXX of Jer; rather it is the relationship of the Gk text to the Heb MT text that in the minds of most scholars is the crucial issue. As is well known, the LXX is considerably shorter than the corresponding MT text--according to the calculations of Graf and Giesebrecht approximately 2,700 words in the MT text (=1/8 of the total) are unrepresented in the LXX.²⁹ Additionally there is the problem of the transpositions of various passages, mainly--though not exclusively--the section of the Oracles Against the Nations which in the MT comes in the penultimate position of the book (Chs. 46-51) while in the Gk it appears in the middle (25:14-31:44) as well as being found in a different internal order.³⁰ Finally there are the usual number of qualitative differences between the two texts where the LXX gives a different reading or meaning in comparison with the MT.

The discovery of these discrepancies does not belong, of course, to modern times, the matter having been commented upon already by Origen in his Letter to Africanus where he asserts that in Jer he found "many instances" of divergence between the two versions as well as "much transposition and variation in the readings of the prophecies" (πολλὰ ἢ μεταθέσεις καὶ ἐν ἀλλαγῇ τῆς λέξεως τῶν προφητευσομένων) (PG 11, col. 56).³¹ How the discrepancies between the Heb and Gk texts of Jer and other biblical books arose is not discussed at length by Origen, though in the same Letter to Africanus he suggests that at least for some of the discrepancies the rabbis may have been at fault (e.g. in the case of the "omission" of the story of Susanna from the Heb),³² while in his Commentary on Matthew (xv, 14) he blames careless scribes for the corrupt state of Gk MSS, both OT and NT.³³ But where Origen remained silent, others who followed him would press for specific explanations. In the history of the investigation of the shorter/longer texts of Jer, four theories, broadly speaking, have been proposed to account for the differences between them. These may be labeled the "abbreviation", "editorial", "expansion", and "mediating" theories, respectively.

1) The "abbreviation" theory. The most common approach has been to regard the Gk text as an abbreviated or mutilated version of the Heb. Such abbreviation has been blamed either on copyists (so Jerome, Grabe), or more frequently on the original translator(s) (e.g. M.G.L. Spohn, J. Wichelhaus, K.H. Graf, C.F. Keil, C. von Orelli). The theory implies that the LXX was translated from a basically similar or identical Vorlage to that of the MT; normally it also holds as original the MT order and arrangement of the OAN section.

2) The "editorial" theory. The first scholar to oppose the idea of a deliberately abbreviated LXX was J.G. Eichhorn who, in the 3rd volume of his Einleitung in Das Alte Testament (³1803), took issue with the views of Jerome and Grabe on the one hand (p. 152) and those of Spohn (pp. 174-178) on the other. Instead, Eichhorn advanced the theory that the two texts derive from two different editions or recensions of the book produced by Jer himself, the one an early copy which became the basis of the LXX translation in Egypt, the other a reworked copy sent to the exiles in Babylon and later introduced to Palestine with the returning exiles (pp. 137 ff.). His views were adopted by some, e.g. L. Bertholdt, but by 1892 A. Kuenen could say that the theory was /e then held by hardly anyone (Historisch-kritische Einleitung, p. 239). Recently, however, the theory has been revived, albeit in a slightly modified form by A. Selms (VT 26 (1976), esp. 112). Mention could also be made in this connexion of T.W. Overholt's view (CBQ 30 (1968), esp. 43-45) that some of the divergencies between the LXX and MT traditions (e.g. the title "Nebuchadnezzar my servant") go back to different versions of the material edited by the prophet himself.

3) The "expansion" theory. On this view the Gk version is the best witness to the text of Jer, the Heb having suffered greatly from expansion, conflation, and interpolation in the course of transmission. The main proponents of this position have been F.C. Movers, A. Scholz, G.C. Workman, and somewhat more moderate, A.W. Streane.

4) The "mediating" theory. According to this theory it is impossible to generalize on the relative merits of the two texts; instead, each reading has to be evaluated on its own merits, resulting sometimes in a preference for the Heb, sometimes for the Gk. As representatives of this view--though varying considerably among themselves--can be cited F. Hitzig, B. Duhm, F. Giesebrecht, P. Volz, W. Rudolph, and J. Bright.

By the middle of the twentieth century, the mediating position seemed firmly entrenched as the consensus view, particularly as given expression in the commentaries of Rudolph and Bright. However, as a result of the Qumran discoveries, some of which contain fragments from Jer with a text approximating to the presumed Heb Vorlage of the LXX, the whole question of the Heb-Gk relationship has of necessity been re-opened. This was done forcibly by G.J. Janzen in the publication of his Harvard dissertation, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 1973. In this work--which to some extent represents the documentation of views already expressed elsewhere by his mentor Frank M. Cross³⁴ Janzen has argued two things: 1) the Gk text was translated from an already shorter Heb Vorlage, and 2) this Vorlage represents an earlier and superior tradition of the Heb text of Jer than that contained in the MT. In effect, therefore, Cross and Janzen have returned to the third theory outlined above, the "expansion" theory.

In the final chapter of this thesis I propose to test the validity of Janzen's challenge to the consensus "mediating" position and his apology for the superiority of the shorter Heb Vorlage underlying the LXX. In doing this it will be necessary to consider not only the LXX "omissions" or quantitative differences between the two texts (as Janzen has done) but also the qualitative differences, for the one has implications for the other. In the journals, Janzen's views have met with varied responses, some of them favourable.³⁵ Nevertheless, it is my conviction on the basis of a thorough study of the material contained in the oracles against the Philistines and Edom that Janzen has overstated his case and that his explanations for the longer form of the Heb text cannot be accepted with anything

resembling the confidence that he attaches to them. A monochrome theory of expansion in the Heb text simply does not do justice to the complexity of the relationship between the LXX and MT traditions, any more than does a dogmatic theory of Gk abbreviation.

The methodology adopted for this investigation is that of focusing attention on a specific passage which is tangent in significant ways to each of the problem areas posed. We believe that Ch. 29, consisting in the LXX of the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, provides us with such a passage. It adequately illustrates the Gk transmission history of the book (Ch. 2), and provides a firm basis for evaluating the text-critical principles and accuracy of Ziegler's Göttingen edition of the text (Ch. 3). For the translator/reviser problem (Ch. 4), the chosen passage is obviously pivotal since it is precisely at the commencement of LXX Ch. 29 that the lexical differences in the second half of the book begin to appear. A remarkably high percentage (over 20%) of all the vocabulary on which the translator/reviser theories are based is illustrated in the Philistine and Edom oracles. For example, Tov's case for a reviser theory as opposed to a multiple translator theory rests principally on 45 instances of unusual renditions common to Jer a' and Jer b'; twelve of the 45 (or 26%) are found in Ch. 29. Finally, the Gk/Heb problem (Ch. 5) is amply illustrated in the Philistine and Edom oracles. Not only are they part of the larger section of foreign nation oracles located in different positions in the two texts--thus bringing into play the subject of the transpositions--but also they bear witness to a significant number of variants in the relationship between the two texts, both with regard to length and content, thus providing a point of departure for a critique of Janzen's monograph on the divergent forms of the LXX and MT texts.

By employing in this way one small section as a touchstone for evaluating different problem levels in the LXX of Jer, it is hoped that their interdependence will also be highlighted. The three works which form the backdrop to the discussion in Chs. 3-5--those of Ziegler, Tov, and Janzen--are all specialized studies of

individual aspects of the Gk text. Such specialized studies, necessary in their own right, nevertheless suffer from a certain loss of perspective in relation to the whole. The situation can be compared to the experience of excavating a tell. One can choose to excavate either an entire horizontal level of a tell, or to sink a shaft in a (hopefully) strategic position of the tell. Both methods are valid for different purposes, the former for a comprehensive understanding of one level of civilization, the latter for a cross-sectional overview of different levels of civilization. For the purposes of this study we have, as it were, chosen the "shaft" method. It is recognized that this method is not without its own limitations, but its effectiveness for achieving the goals set forth will, we trust, be vindicated in the ensuing chapters.

CHAPTER 2

THE TEXT-CRITICAL PROBLEM (1):

AN INDUCTIVE STUDY OF THE MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE FOR LXX JEREMIAH 29

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the textual evidence pertaining to Ch. 29 of the LXX version of Jeremiah. By means of an inductive and independent investigation of the MS variants attested for the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, the analysis seeks to trace the various stages of revision and corruption through which the Gk text of this section has passed back to the earliest MS witnesses at our disposal. The discussion will proceed under three headings: I) Description of the Evidence, II) Collation of the Evidence, III) Grouping of the Evidence.

I. Description of the Evidence

The primary source material for the text-critical study of this chapter is to be found in A) Gk MSS containing the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, B) patristic citations, and C) ancient daughter versions of the LXX. Of these, by far the most important are the Gk MSS themselves. The following is a list of the extant witnesses to the text of Jer 29 employed in this study.

A. Greek MSS

A total of 39 Gk MSS have been collated for this investigation.¹ Of these, 5 are uncials and 34 are minuscules. The MS information cited below is taken primarily from Rahlfs' Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments and Ziegler's Göttingen edition, though some of the data in these sources has

been updated or corrected according to the results of my own enquiries.

1. Uncials

- A "Codex Alexandrinus",² London, British Museum, Royal 1 D.VI; 5th cent. Jer 29 is found on pp. 347^b-348 of the codex.
- B "Codex Vaticanus", Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 1209; 4th cent. Jer 29 on pp. 1099-1100.
- Q "Codex Marchalianus",³ Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 2125; 6th cent. Jer 29 on pp. 442-446.
- S "Codex Sinaiticus",⁴ London, British Museum, Additional MS 43725 (199 leaves); Leipzig, Universitäts-Bibliothek, Cod. gr. 1 (43 leaves; this part of the codex is technically known as "Cod. Friderico-Augustanus"); Leningrad Public Library (3 fragments); 4th cent. Jer 29 is found in the Leipzig portion of the codex, pp. 30-30^b (pp. 106-106* in Helen and Kirsopp Lake's photo facsimile reproduction, Oxford, 1922).
- V "Codex Venetus",⁵ Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Gr. 1; 8th cent. Jer 29 on pp. 86^b-87.

2. Minuscules

- 22 London, British Museum, Royal 1 B. II; 11th-12th centuries. Philistine oracle on pp. 241-241^b; Edom oracle on pp. 245-246.⁶
- 26 Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 556; 10th century. Jer 29 on pp. 156-157.
- 36 Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 347; 11th century. Philistine oracle on pp. 216^b-217; Edom oracle on pp. 220-221.
- 46 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Coislin 4; 13th-14th centuries. Jer 29 on pp. 359^b-360.
- 48 Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 1794; 10th-11th centuries. Philistine oracle on pp. 249^b-250; Edom oracle on pp. 253-254.
- 49 Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plutei XI 4; 11th century. Jer 29 on pp. 221^b-223.

- 51 Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plutei X 8; 11th century. The Oracles Against the Nations occur twice in this MS, the first time in the usual LXX position and internal order in the middle of the book, the second time in the MT position and order at the end of the book. In the first instance Jer 29 is found on pp. 223^b-225, in the second part (in my notes referred to as 51^s(s=supplement)), the Philistine oracle is found on pp. 266^b-267 and the Edom oracle on pp. 270-271^b.
- 62 Oxford, New College, 44; 11th century. Philistine oracle on p. 97^b; Edom oracle on pp. 99-99^b.
- 68 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Gr. 5; 15th century. Jer 29 on pp. 197-198.
- 86 "Codex Barberinus", Rome, Vatican Library, Barberini gr. 549; 9th-10th centuries. Jer 29, including commentary of Olympiodorus, on pp. 157-159.
- 87 Rome, Vatican Library, Chigi R. VIII 54;⁷ 10th century. Jer 29 on pp. 304-305.
- 88 "Codex Chisianus", Rome, Vatican Library, Chigi R. VII 45;⁸ 10th century. Philistine oracle on pp. 94-94^b; Edom oracle on pp. 98-99^b.
- 90 Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plutei V 9; 11th century. Jer 29 on pp. 170^b-171^b.
- 91 Rome, Vatican Library, Ottoboniani gr. 452; 11th century. Jer 29 on pp. 168^b-169.
- 96 Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, Ny Kongelige Samling, 4^o, Nr. 5; 11th century. Philistine oracle on pp. 134^b-135; Edom oracle on pp. 137^b-138^b.
- 106 Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale, 187 II;⁹ 14th century. Jer 29 on p. 94.
- 122 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Gr. 6; 15 century. Jer 29 on pp. 166-167.
- 130 Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Theologici gr. 23;^{9a} 12th-13th centuries. Jer 29 on pp. 419^b-420.
- 233 Rome, Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 2067; 10th century. Jer 29 on pp. 172-173.
- 239 Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, 2603; copied 1046. Jer 29 on pp. 156-157.

- 311 Moscow, formerly The Synod Library, Gr. 354; 12th century. Philistine oracle on p. 222; Edom oracle on pp. 224-225.
- 407 Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library, Τάφου 2; 9th century. Philistine oracle on p. 335; Edom oracle on pp. 336^b-337.
- 410 Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library, Τάφου 36; 13th century. Palimpsest. Jer 29 on pp. 270-272.
- 449 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, E. 3 inf.; 10th-11th centuries. Jer 29 on pp. 3^b-4^b.
- 490 Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Gr., 472; 11th century. Jer 29 on pp. 209-210.
- 534 Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, Coislin 18; 11th century. Jer 29 on pp. 71^b-72.
- 538 Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, Coislin 191; 12th century. Jer 29 on pp. 262^b-264.
- 544 Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, Gr. 15; 11th century. Jer 29 on pp. 186-188.
- 613 Patmos, Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου 209; 13th century. Jer 29 on pp. 359-360.
- 631 Raudnitz, Lobkowitz'sche Bibliothek, VI. E. f. 19; 14th century. Jer 29 on pp. 123-124.
- 710 Sinai, St. Catharine's Monastery, Cod. gr. 5; 10th century. Jer 29 on pp. 95-96^b.
- 763 Athens, Μονὴ Βατοπεδίου 514; 11th century. Philistine oracle on pp. 194^b-195; Edom oracle on pp. 195^b-196^b.
- 764 Athens, Λωύρα 169; 13th-14th centuries. Jer 29 on pp. 147^b-149.
- 770 Athens, Λωύρα 234; 12th century. Jer 29 on pp. 104-105.
- 986 Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, P. Antinoopolis 53; 6th-7th centuries.

B. Patristic Citations

The extant evidence from patristic sources for the text of Jer 29 is to be found in four commentaries written on the text of Jer and in several quotations scattered throughout various works of early christian literature.

1. Commentaries

John Chrysostom (d.407). All that remains of Chrysostom's

commentary on the text of Jer are those portions preserved in a few Catena MSS. These selections, taken mainly from Vat. 675, Vat. 1204, and especially from an Altemps Library MS, were collected by Michael Ghisler in his monumental work, Ieremiam Prophetam Comentarii (1623). From there they were reprinted in Migne, PG 64 (=Chr. XIII) but with the lemma texts taken not from Chrysostom but from some textus receptus or composed in an ad hoc way. Also, citations from within Chrysostom's commentary itself were not always fully reproduced in Migne. For these reasons, collation of Chrysostom's Jer citations must be based on Ghisler's edition and not on Migne. According to Ghisler, the following verses from Jer 29 are partially or wholly quoted by Chrysostom: 4, 5, 7, 14, 20.

Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460?). Theodoret is our richest source of Jer citations from among the Church Fathers. His commentary on Jer has been published in full by J.L. Schulze, Theodoreti Opera Omnia (Vol. 2, 1770; Philistine oracle on pp. 592-593; Edom oracle on pp. 602-606), reprinted in Migne, PG 81 (Philistine oracle on cols. 716-717; Edom oracle on cols. 728-733). The text is based mainly on two MSS in the Staatsbibliothek of Munich: Gr. 117 from the sixteenth century (designated "B" by Schulze, from "bavaricus": cf. Schulze, Vol. 2, p. 403, and Rahlfs, Verzeichnis, p. 433, n. 4) and Gr. 472 (=LXX MS 490, see above) from the eleventh century (designated by Schulze as "Cod." or "Cod. august(anus)", and from p. 403 onwards, simply as "A"). According to the text of Schulze, all verses except 1, 2, 19, and 22, are cited either in whole or in part by Theodoret.

Olympiodorus (sixth century). The commentary of Olympiodorus is contained in "Codex Barberinus" (see above MS 86). It was partially published by Ghisler in his compendium and reprinted by Migne, PG 93 (Philistine oracle on col. 705; Edom oracle on cols. 710-712). But because the lemma texts in these editions are not to be trusted, collation must be based on the actual MS, which consists of alternating sections of LXX text and Olympiodorus commentary. Contrary to the impression given by Migne, the commentary follows the order of the Gk text, not the Heb.

The commentary itself consists of short citations from the text of Jer accompanied by explanatory comments. From Jer 29, parts of the following verses are quoted by Olympiodorus; 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23.

Basilus of Neopatrae (9th century). The commentary on Jer of this late and less important Greek Father has never been published. It is extant in two MSS: the 12th century MS 31, in Patmos, and the 12th century Vatican gr. 1687 in Rome. A collation of the Patmos MS exists in the collation books for Jer at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen.

2. Citations

Clement of Alexandria (d. before 225) quotes from Jer 29:20 in Stromata, Book 2, Ch. 15 (GCS, Clem. II, p. 148; PG 8, col. 1004).

Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 339) cites names from vv. 5, 8, 9, and 20 in Onomasticon (GCS, Eus. III, pp. 38, 80, 90, 102).

Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394) quotes from v. 20 in Testimonia adversus Iudaeos, Ch. 20 (PG 46 (=Greg. III), col. 232).

Didymus the Blind of Alexandria (d. 398?) quotes from vv. 5-6 in In Zachariam (SC 83, p. 380).

Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) quotes from v. 2 in his commentary In Sophoniam (PG 71 (=Cyr. IV), col. 984).

Sacra Parallela quotes from vv. 8-9 (PG 96 (=Joannes Damas-enus III), col. 348).

Liber de divinis scripturis sive speculum, Ch. 130, quotes from vv. 2-3 (CSEL 12, pp. 677-678).¹¹

C. Daughter Versions

Six ancient versions translated directly from the LXX are included in my collation notes of Jer 29. In chronological order

of translation these are the Old Latin, the Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic dialects), the Syriac, the Ethiopic, the Arabic, and the Armenian.

1. Old Latin

The only extant witness to the Old Latin text of Jer 29 is a fragment in "Codex Sangallensis" 912 containing a passage from 29:13-19. The collation is taken from F.C. Burkitt's publication, "The S. Gallen Fragment of Jeremiah," in Texts and Studies 4 (1896), 79-92, which constitutes an appendix to his article on "The Old Latin and the Itala."

2. Coptic

The Coptic translation of Jer 29 has been preserved in the Bohairic and Sahidic dialects. An edition of the Bohairic was published in 1852 by H. Tattam, together with a Latin translation: Prophetæ majores, in linguae aegyptiacae memphitica seu coptica, Oxford, 1852. The Sahidic of Jer 29 exists in two papyri fragments. The first contains 28:59-29:4, published by G. Maspero, Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Ancien Testament (Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, vol. 6, fasc. 1.2), Paris, 1892, p. 239. The second fragment contains 29:3-23, published by C. Wessely, Griechische und Koptische Texte, theologischen Inhalts IV (Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, XV), Leipzig, 1914, p. 83.

3. Syriac

The Syriac version of the LXX (called the Syrohexapla because it was translated--in 616/17 by Paul of Tella--from Origen's hexaplaric recension) is found in the 8th century "Codex Ambrosianus", first published, along with a Latin translation, by Matth. Norberg in 1787: Codex Syriaco-Hexaplaris Ambrosiano-Mediolanensis, London/Gothenborg (Philistine oracle on pp. 236-239; Edom oracle on pp. 248-253). A reprint of Norberg's Latin translation is found in PG 16, cols. 2299-2394. A photographed

facsimile copy of the codex was issued by A.M. Ceriani in Monumenta sacra et profana, tom. VIII, Milan, 1874.

4. Ethiopic

There exists no published edition of the Ethiopic version of Jer. Of the various Ethiopic MSS, Ziegler (following J. Schüfers) has determined that the Ethiopic is best preserved in the Berlin codex, MS orient. fol. 3067 Geez (see Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 30).

5. Arabic

The collation is taken from Brian Walton's London Polyglot, 1657, pp. 281-283, accompanied by Latin translation.¹²

6. Armenian

The Armenian text is found in J. Zohrabian's edition, Venice, 1805, from where it was collated by Ziegler in the Septuaginta-Unternehmen notes.

II. Collation of the Evidence

This section contains my fresh collation of the MS variants for LXX Jer. 29. The collation of the four main uncials A, B, Q, and S has been based on the official photo reproductions of those MSS published in the case of Codex Alexandrinus by the British Museum (1883), in the case of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Marchalianus by the Vatican Library (1907 and 1890 respectively) and in the case of Codex Sinaiticus by the Oxford Press (1922, prepared by Helen and Kirsopp Lake). The collation of the other Gk MSS is based on photographs or microfilms, most of which were made available to me at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen. For the patristic sources I have consulted the standard published editions as cited above, except for the commentary of Olympiodorus which is based directly on Codex Barberinus (MS 86). In the case of the Sahidic, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions I have been entirely dependent on the Göttingen collation books. For those

of the Bohairic, Syriac, and Arabic versions I have also relied heavily on the Göttingen collation notes, but have been able to check these against the published texts and accompanying Latin translations. The versional evidence where it diverges from the Gk is usually cited in Latin form, except for the Syrohexapla, which, because of its sister relationship to MS 88, is regularly cited in Gk transliteration.

The base text is essentially that of the Sixtine textus receptus (in the edition published by Samuel Bagster and Sons, London), albeit slightly modified at a few points; e.g., when the Sixtine text prints a reading unique to Codex Vaticanus or the B group, the majority text has been adopted in the base column so as not to overload the collation notes. The base text has, of course, no critical value; its function is strictly utilitarian as a means of exhibiting in the most practical way the many "variation units"¹³ within this chapter.

29:1-2

ρτ. εϖι τους αλλοφυλους ✓ * λογος κυριου
ος εγενηθη προς ιερεμιαν τον προφητην ✓ 54

ρτ. εϖι τους αλλοφυλους (-λλους 311) ος (ως 62)
εγενετο λογος κυριου προς ιερεμιαν (ιη. 62 449)
τον προφητην 51 62 311 449 770

ρτ. ος εγενηθη λογος κυριου προς ιερεμιαν
τον προφητην * 88 = (om. x.) α' σ' Q^{mg}

Εϖι

τους

αλλοφύλους.

$\left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} > 106 538^*$
 $\left. \begin{array}{l} \alpha' \text{ προς φυλιστιαιους } 54^{mg} \\ \sigma' \text{ περι των φυλιστιαιων } 86^{mg} \end{array} \right\}$

+ προ του παταξαι φαραω την γαζαν * Q^{mg}
51 62 * 88 311 449 770 * 54 = (om. x.) α' σ' 86^{mg}

+ ος (ως 22*) εγενετο λογος κυριου προς
ιερεμιαν τον προφητην προ του παταξαι φαραω
την γαζαν 22 ÷ 36 48 51^s 96 407 763

Τάδε λέγει
κύριος

v. 2 '1800

ύδατα

αναβαίνει

+ δη Cyr IV, p. 984

- βεννι A
- βαινη 239

- βεννι S*

ερκεται

- βενη 26 - βαιννι 62
Cyr IV, p. 984

από

εϖι 106

βορρα,

βορραν S*

29:2

καὶ

ἔσται

εἰς

χειμάρρουν

κατακλύζοντα,

καὶ

κατακλύσει

γῆν

καὶ

τὸ πλήρωμα

αὐτῆς,

πόλιν

καὶ

τοὺς

κατοικοῦντας

ἐν αὐτῇ.

καὶ

κεκράξονται

εστε S*

> Spec p. 677

α' και εσονται 86^{ms}χι. Α χειμαρρον S* (-ουν S^c)
χειμαρρον 534pl. (torrentes
inundantes) B_o

-σι Α S* -κλυζει 46

-καυσει 239 410 κλυσει 534

α' και
κυκλωσουσι 86^{ms}

pr. την 449 538

> Arm

πολις S* 544 pl. Arm

et urbem cum
plenitudo eius Aeth^B> Aeth^B

ενοι. Α 106

> Arm Sa^{Ma} B_oκραξονται S* (-οντε vi. α.) 62 86^c

29:2-3

οἱ

> 87

} universi Spec

ἄνθρωποι,

καὶ

ἀλαλάξουσιν

-ουσι 86 90 233 239 534 613 710

-ονται A

ἀλαλάξουσι 130 (-σιν) 106^c Bas N

ἀλαξουσι 46 106^{*} 544 (-σιν) 613

ολολυξουσι 22^c 36 48^c 51-51^s 62

96 311 407 763 770

ολολυξουσι 22^{*} 48^{*} 449

peribunt Arab

α' και
ολολυξουσι
παντες 86^{mg}

ἅπαντες

παντες A V 22 26 36 46 48 49

51-51^s 62 86 90 96 106 233 239 311

407 449 534 613 631 710 763 764

770 Bas N

οἱ

κατοικοῦντες

-αις S^{*}

τὴν

γῆν,

v.3 ἀπὸ

φωνῆς

ὀργῆς

αὐτοῦ

οργης 239

pl. eius Bo

} α' δρομου ιππων
S^{yh}^{ms}

} ιω' προσωπου
οργης θυμου
86^{mg} Q^{ms} (anon.)

29:3

ἀπὸ

pr. και 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449 763
 770 Aeth^B
 + voce Sa^{we Ha}

τῶν

ὀπλῶν

armis Sylh Aeth Arm Arab Spec
 + αὐτοῦ 22 36 48 51^s 62 96
 311 407 763

τῶν

pr. και S*

pr. και αὐτοῦ 106 Spec (et a)

θ' ὀπλῶν αὐτοῦ
 τῶν δυνατῶν 86^m
 Q^m (δυνατῶ)

ποδῶν

δυνατῶν 22 36 48 51^s 62 96
 311 763 δυναμῶν 407
 πολλῶν 130 538

αὐτοῦ

÷ 86 αὐτῶν 106
 + δυνατῶν 51 449 770

καὶ

ἀπὸ

σεισμοῦ

σεισ/μου B* σει/σμου B^c
 σισμου S 86^c 407 544(?)

τῶν

> Arm

ἄρμάτων

ιω' τεθριππων 86^m

αὐτοῦ

αὐτῶν 544 Spec (eorum)
 + et a Spec Aeth Arm

29:3-4

ἡχοῦ

pr. καὶ A 22 36 48 51-51^s 62
 87 90 91 96 106 311 407 410 449
 490 534 613 763 764 770 Arab B^o
 ηχοῦς 538 α'σ' πληθους Syh^m

> 88

α'σ' πληθους
 τροχων αὐτου
 86^m

τροχῶν

pr. των A 410 τροχου S*

αὐτοῦ.

οὐκ

pr. et Arm

ἐπέστρεψαν

εστρεψαν S* επεστρεψα ει απεστρεψαν 239

πατέρες

pr. οι 88

ἐπὶ

εφ B S 68 122 130

υἱοῦς

ους 46 υιοις 130

αὐτῶν

ἀπο

pr. εφ 763 (vid.)

ἐκλύσεως

εκκλυσεως 239 Bas N

χειρῶν

χειρων S* (vid.) χειρος 239 Bas N

αὐτῶν

αυτου 96 130

v. 4 ἐν

τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τῇ

ἐρχομένη

επερχομενη B 68 122

> Acth^p (hab. Acth^p)

29:4

τοῦ

ἀπολέσαι

- σε S* αφανισαι 88 S^h απολεσθαι 410

πάντας

pr. συν 86^m * 88
απαντας 538 > Aeth^B

τούς

> Th^t

ἄλλοφύλους

- λλους 48 λαους Th^t^r } σ' τους φυλιστῖαιους
86^m

καὶ ἀφανιῶ

τήν

τύρον

τυρων 538

καὶ

τήν

> Th^t

Σιδῶνα

σειδονα B* σιδωρα 22 σιδονα 130*
σειδωνα 68 122 = Sixt

καὶ

πάντας

> Th^t

τούς

καταλοίπους

- λυπους S* (vid.)

τῆς

> 239 Bas^N

βοηθείας

- θιας S 62 544(?) βοης 106

αὐτῶν

29:4-5

"ΟΤΙ

ἐξολοθρεύσει

-λεθρεύσει $AB^*Q 86^* 544$ (-λεθρεύσει)
 -ωλεθρεύσει S^* (-ωλεθρεύσει S^*) -ση 91

κύριος

+ τους αλλοφυλους 22 46 51-51' $\cdot \times 88$ 96
 311 (-λλους) 407 449 763 770 Tht Chr
 $\cdot \times \Sigma h$ Ar μ = ο' $\cdot \times 86^m$, α'θ' $\cdot \times Q^m$
 + τους αλλοφυλους και 36

tr.
 ἐξολ./κύριος
 B \circ Σ^w Arab

τούς

τας A 49 86 87 90 91
 410 490 764

sing.
 B \circ

κατάλοιπους

+ τους αλλοφυλους 62

τῶν

νήσων.

+ και καππαδοκίας 22 36 48 51-51'
 62 88 96 311 407 $\cdot \times 449$ 763 $\cdot \times 770$
 Tht Chr Σh Ar μ = α'θ' $\cdot \times Q^m$
 οι γ' + καππαδοκας 86^m

ιω' τα λειψανα
 των νησων 86^m

v.5 "Ηκει

εκει 407

φαλάκρωμα

φαρακλωμα 26

ἐπὶ

τάξαν

πασαν κεφαλην 407
 + και 62 106 410 B \circ Act κ^B

ἀπερρίφη

-ερίφη $AB^*QS 62 86 538 544$
 απερριφει 91

α' ηφανισθη
 ασκαλων 86^m
 σ' εσιωπησεν
 ασκαλων 86^m

Ἀσκάλων

.σκαλωνα Σh

καὶ

÷ 86

29:5-6

οί

τα Α 106

sing. Βο

τα λοιπα 22 36 48 51-

51^s 62 86^m 88 96 311

407 449 763 770 Tht

Chr Sgh

κατάλοιποι

-λοιπα Α 106 534

Ἐνακείμ

ργ. των 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407

449 763 770 Tht Chr

-κίμ 22 46 48 86 87 91 96 407 490

εναμ 534 εν Ακίμ Chr

εμακείμ Ευσ Onom. p. 90, l. 13in agim Sgh Sa^w Arabα'σ' των κοιλαδων Sgh^m Ευσ Onom.ο εβρ' κοιλαδες Sgh^mα' το κατα-
λμμα των
κοιλαδων
86^m

v. 6 "Εως

ργ. εως ποτε συστραφησεσθε

22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449763 770 Tht Sgh^m

τίνος

ποτε Δια

κόψεις

-ψης S* (νικ) 62 87 233 311 534

-ψεται 407 -ψει 410 Tht^{te} Olymσυνκοψει Tht^Bα' εως ποτε
εφελκυσθηση
ω μαχαιρα 86^mσ' εως ποτε
συστραφησεσθε
ω μαχαιρα 86^m

ή

> Olym

μάχαιρα

-χερα S

του

> Α 88 106 410

Κυρίου ;

κυριε 410 Θεου 544

+ amputabisne Arab

ἕως τίνος

οὐχ

ουκ Α Β* Q 26 68 86 538 544

ου μη S 534

29: 6-7

ἡσυχάσεις;

συχασίς S* (ἡσυχασίς S^c)

ἡσυχασής 87 233 311 534

ἡσυχασί 106 εἰσυχασίς 544

ἀποκατάστηθι

- καταστήσῃ 544

- καταστής Olymp επιστραφήτι Di4

εἰς

τόν

το 130

κολεόν

κουλεον 88 106 613

ξίφοθηκη 26^mα' σ' θ' ομοίως 86^m

σου,

ἀνάπαυσαι

- σε S - σον 62

αναπασαν 449

καὶ

α' ταχυνον και
σιωπησον 86^m

ἐπάρθητι.

ἡσυχασον 22 36 48 51-51^s 96311 407 449 763 770 Th^t

ἡσυχασί 62. επαροντι 122

v.7 πῶςpr. et Aeth^B> Th^t (vid.)

ἡσυχάσει,

- σεῖς A 410 - σι S* - σῃ

καὶ

οτι 534 Arm quod Aeth^B > Sa^{We} Bo

κύριος

pr. ου S* (ο S^c)

ἐντεκίλατο

εντεκίλατο S* (vid.)

συνεταξάτο 86^m

αὐτῇ

> Aeth^B

29:7-8

ἐπὶ

τὴν Ἀσκάλωνα

καὶ

ἐπὶ

τάς

παραθαλασσίους,

τοὺς 534 613

— θαλασσίους 86 130* 538

+ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀσκάλωνα 534

+ καὶ 22 36 46 48 49 51-51^s 62 87 90 91 96 311

407 410 449 490 613 631 763 764 770

The Syr Bo Sm^{We} Aeth^B

ἐπὶ

τάς

καταλοίπους

ἐπεκερθῆναι

τοὺς 26 46 130 239 410
534 613 631 BasNsing.
Boα'σ' ἐκεῖ δὴ
συνεταξεν αὐτὴ
Syr^{ms}

— πού A

ἐκερθῆναι 534 πορευθῆναι The
> Sm^{We} Bo

v. 8 Τῇ

Ἰδουμαία,

τάδε

λέγει

κύριος,

pr. verbum propter Sm^{We}Ιουμα S^r, Ἰδουμαί 36 -μα Bo
Ιουδαία 49 90* 534 764> 46 106 538* (hab.)
631 Arm^Pσ' τὴν ἐδωκεν 86^{ms}

οὐδε 534

> Q^{tot} (hab. ms.) + τῶν δυνάμεων * Q^{ms}
22 36 48 51-51^s 62 88 96 311 407 449 763 770
Syr Arm ο' 86^{ms}

29:8-9

οὐκ

ἔστιν

ἔτι

σοφία

ἐν

Θαυμάν,

ἀπώλετο

βουλή

ἐκ

συνετῶν,

ᾤχετο

σοφία

αὐτῶν,

ἠπατήθη

ὁ

τόπος

αὐτῶν.

α' μη 86^{ms} σ' αρα 86^{ms}ἔστι Th^t> 407 Th^t SacPar

ἐν 710

σοφος Sa^{we}α' συνεισιν 86^{ms}Θεμαν S 62 SacPar^p BasN Bo Armεπ. A απο. SacPar^p pr. et Bo Aethσυμβουλή 22 36 48 51^s 96 763συν/ετων B^x συνε/των B^c
υνετων 62 + et Bo Aeth^pα' σ' εξ υιων 86^{ms}α' ηρανισθη Syl^{ms}

pr. η 51 239 407 449 770

αυτου Arm + et Bo Aeth^p> 22 36 (> ωχιστο ... λαθων
v.9) 48 51^s 62 96 711 763
Th^tεπατηθη 87 91 490 Syl Arab (exclusus)
ηπατηθι 239

> 106 (hap.)

το S^{*} * 88 > 130 410προς S^{*}αυτον S^{*} αυτου Th^t tot Arm totσ' εφυγον απεστραφη
Syl^{ms}α' εφυγον απεστραφησαν...
(cont. next page)

29:9

βαθύνετε

εις

κἀθίσιν

οἱ

κατοικοῦντες

ἐν

Δαιδάν,

ὅτι

δύσκολα

ἐποίησεν.

ἢ
ἡγάγον

ἐπ'

αὐτὸν

ἐν

χρόνῳ

βαθύνετε 233 βαθυ συνετε 534

πρ. εαυτοῖς A Q 36 49 86 90 91

233 239 410 449 490 534 613 710 764

770 Olymp Bas N Sa^{we} Bo Acth^p Aras

πρ. ἐν αὐτοῖς 106 πρ. εαυτοῦς 87 538 Pht

-ησιν A 26 36 62 88 91 407 Pht^B

καυχῆσιν 534

... εβαθυναν κατοικησαι
86^m (concl. from preceding
page)α' εβαθυναν κατοικησαι
Syn^mσ' ἐν οικωαν βαθει
ωκησαν 86^mω' καταδυατε εἰς
χεσματα οικητωρες
86^m-ται S^x κακουντες 86^x> Q^{tut} ÷ 86

δαιδαν B 68 122

δαδανω 534

δεδαν 407 538 544 Ar^{tut}δεδαν Bo δαδαν Syn Aras Ar^rα' σ' οτι απωλειαν
ησαν 86^mθ' οτι απωλεσαν
ησαν 86^mα' απωλειαν
ησαν επηγαγον
Syn^m

πρ. εις 538

πρ. ορετα Bo

-σαν + et Acth^p

ει γεγονεν 410

ηγαγεν 534

επ B^x ε/π B^c

> Q 62 Olymp

αυτην 538

πρ. Ar^m

πρ. γαρ Bo

εκθρον εν 407

29:9-10

ω̃

ἐπεσκεψάμην

ἐνεσκεψάμην 534

ἐπ'

εν S* om. A V 22 48 51-51^s 62 86 88 96
 239 311 407 449 534 538 544 710 763 770 Th^t
 Bas N Syn Arm

αὐτόν.

αυτην S 26 410 Aeth^B Arab αυτω 91 490

v. 10 "οτι

τρυγῆται

τρυγητε S* τρυγησται 91

ἦλθον,

+ σοι A Q* V 22 26 36⁴⁶ 48 51-51^s 62
 86 88 96 130 233 239 311 407 449 534 544
 631 710 763 770 Th^t Olymp Bas N Arm

σ' ει τρυγηται
 επηλθον σοι
 ουκ αν απελειπον
 86^{ms}

οι

> A Q* V 46 86 130 534 544 631 710
 Syn ο 764 > Sa^{we} και Th^t Arm

ου

> S* 62 Aeth ουκ 233 239

καταλείψουσιν

-σιν A Q V 22* 26 48 49 51^s 96⁶⁸ 122 407
 534 538 710 763 764 Bas N
 -λιψουσιν B* S 490 544 -λιψουσι 91
 εγκαταλειψουσιν 233 239 (-σι)

σοι

σε 490 σου 538 > 410 Th^t^B

κατάλειμμα.

-λιμμα B* S 26 91 490 764 -λειμμα 106
 -λειμματα Q* V 46 130 233 538 (-λη-) 631 710 Th^t
 Sa^{we} Bas Arm -λιμματα A Q^c 86 544
 καταλειμματα 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 88 96 311 407 449
 763 770 Syn = ο' 86^{ms}
 α'σ' επιφυλλιδας Syn^{ms} ρηγματα 86^{ms}

29:10-11

ὥς

ὥσπερ A 49 87 90 91 106 410 490 613 764
 ὥσει Q V 22 26 36 46 48 51-51^s 62 86 88 96
 130 233 239 311 407 449 534 538 544 631 710 763 770

κλέπται

κλέπται S*

ἐν νυκτὶ,

ἐπιθήσουσι

-σιν B S Q V 26 48 49 51^{s*} 96 122 407
 544 763 764 ἐπιθήσουσιν A
 -θουσουσιν 22* (-θειςουσιν 22^c)
 + σοι Q^{mg} 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96
 311 407 449 763 770 Tht^B

οὐκ αν
 ηφανισαν
 τα ικανα
 εν αυτοις S^{mg}

χείρα

χειρας A Q S (χι.) 49 87 88 90 91
 130 (pt. τας) 233 239 410 490 613 764 B₀ Arm

αὐτῶν.

επ αυτον 538 S^{we} B₀ (super eam) Arm (super eos)

ν. 11 ὅτι ἐγώ

κατέσφα

A κατηραυνησα

τὸν Ἡσαῦ,

+ et Aeth^B Arm

ἀνεκάλυψα

ανα. S* -φαν 130 απ. 410 (via.)
 απεκαλυφα α' 86^{mg} , α' σ' S^h^{mg}
 απεστεγασα σ' 86^{mg} } > Arab

τὰ

τε S*

κρυπτά

γλυπτα 86^{txt} (κρ.^{mg}) 710

αὐτῶν,

αυτου 239 S^h Aeth^B Arm Bas N σου Tht^B

κρυβῆναι

pt. και 410 B₀ Aeth^B Arm

οὐ

29:11

μή

> 534

δύνωνται,

-ονται 26 233 534 -ωντε 544 -ηται Tht Aech^B

ἔλονται

ἔλονται Q^c 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 86^{ms} * 88 96
 106 130 311 407 449 763 770 Tht * Syn Arm
 ὀλονται 544 α'θ' ἐταλαιπώρησεν 86^{ms}
 σ' διεφθάρη 86^{ms} α' ἐπρονομεύθη Syn^{ms}

ο' ἔλονται
 σπέρμα αὐτοῦ
 86^{ms}

διὰ

pt. σπέρμα αὐτοῦ 51 62 88 311 407 449
 770 Syn Tht Arm pt. το σπέρμα αὐτοῦ
 *Q^{ms} 22 36 48 51^s 96 763

χεῖρα

χεῖρα S* χείρος 407 534 Tht^A (-ας Tht^B)

ἀδελφοῦ

αὐτοῦ

σου S* αὐτῶν 534 Arab > Tht Arm

καὶ

> BS 130 68 122 S^{ms} B^o Aech^B

γείτονος

γίτονος A 407 544

αὐτοῦ

μου BS 410 B^o Aech Arab
 αὐτῶν 534 68 122 > 49 87 90 91 106 490 764

καὶ

> Tht (vid.)

οὐκ

ἔστιν

ἔσται 233

+ ο λέγων 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311
 407 449 763 770 Tht^B
 + ο λέγων Tht^{let}

σ' και ουκ
 ἔστιν ος ερει
 ... (cont. next
 page)

v. 12

ὑπολείπεσθαι	- λῑπεσθαι AB* 26 88 130 544 - λῑπεσθε S* - λῑπεσθε 239 407	
ορφανόν	- ους 22 36 48 51-51 ⁵ 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 Th ^t ορφανην 631	
σου	> 26 407 538 σοι 239 Bas ^N	
ἢ ivα		
ζήσῃται·	ζήσεται AB* QSV 26 46 49 86 87 90 91 239 490 534 538 544 710 764 ζήσῃτε 106 σωθῶσι 36 48 51-51 ⁵ 311 449 763 770 Th ^t S ^u S ^h ^{ms} σωθῶσιν 22 62 96 407	
καὶ ἐγὼ	> QV 26 46 86 88 130 233 534 544 631 710 S ^h ^{tt} Arm	
ζήσονται	- σόμε 764 { και ἐγὼ αὐτοὺς διασωσω 22 36 48 51-51 ⁵ 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 S ^h ^{ms} Th ^t	
καὶ		
αἱ	> BQSV 26 46 86 88 130 534 538 544 631 710 Olym ^p	
χήραι	χήρε S χεῖρες 62 407 χεῖρα 68 + σου 22 36 48 51-51 ⁵ 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 Th ^t + αὐτῶν Arm	
ἐπὶ		
ἐμὲ	εμοι 613 Th ^t	
πεποιθήσιν·	πεποιθῶσαν 51-51 ⁵ 62 407 449 770 Th ^t	

(σ')... κατα-
λείπει τοὺς
ορφανούς σο
ἐγὼ διασω-
καὶ χήραι
σου εἰς ἐμὲ
μη ἀμεργί-
τωςαν 86^{ms}

α' καταλείπει
ορφανούς ἐγὼ
ζῶσω σε
καὶ χήραι
σου ἐπὶ
ἐμὲ πε-
ποιθήσουσιν.
S^h^{ms}

v. 13

"ὅτι τάδε

λέγει

εἶπεν BS 68 122 538

κύριος,

pt. 0 538

οἷς

pt. 1800 Q V 22 26 36 48 51-51^s 62 86 88 96 130
 233 239 311 407 449 534 544 613 631 710 763 770 Thet Olymp
 Syl Arm

οὐκ ἦν

νόμος

α'σ'θ' κριμα 86^m Syl^m (sub oi λ')

πιεῖν

πιν S*

τὸ ποτήριον,

ἔτιον.

pt. πιοντες 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 *88 96 311 407 449
 763 770 Thet *Syl Arm α'θ' *Q^m οι γ' *86^m
 pt. πιονται οι λ' Syl^m pt. hoc Bo >534

καὶ

σὺ

ἀθωωμένη

αθωουμένη AV 86 91 534 544 Bas N
 αθωωμένη B* Q S 538 αθωωμένη 46* 631
 αθωουμένη 22 36 48 49 51-51^s 62 87 88 90
 96 106 130 233 239 407 449 490 613 710 763 764 770

οὐ

> 239 407 544 pt. αθωωθηση 22 36 48 51^s
 *88 96 311 763 *Syl Arm θ' *86^m

μή

ἀθωωθῆς

αθωωθης AB*SV 86 91 490 538 Bas N
 αθωωθηση Q αθωωθεις 26 αθωωθεις 534
 αθωωθηση 106. 233 239 407(-wo.) Thet^B

α' και συ
 αυτος
 καθαρισμω
 καθαρισθηση
 ου μη
 καθαριθεις
 86^m

29:13-14

om. B S 106 410
538 La⁵³ Sa⁵⁴ Bo
A⁵⁵ Arab

v. 14 ὅτι

κατ'

ἑαυτοῦ

ῥήματα,

λέγει κύριος,

ὅτι

εἰς

ἁβραάμ

καὶ

εἰς

ὀνειδισμὸν

καὶ

εἰς

πρ. ὅτι πινῶν πιεσάι A V 46 86 233 239 613

πρ. ὅτι πινῶν (πινόντι 534) πιεσάι Q 26 534 544

πρ. ὅτι πινούσα πιεσάι 88 Syh

πρ. ὅτι πινούσα πινῆ 22 36 48 51-51' 62⁹⁶ 311
407 449 763 770

> A

καθ 544

+ enim La⁵³

ῥήματα 613

σ' επ αυτον γαρ ῥήματα
φησι κυριος 86^mπρ. εἰς ἀφανισμόν καὶ 22 36 48
51-51' 62 88 96 311 407 449 763 770 Syh
The Arm = ο' 86^{tr}α' ὅτι εἰς
χερσείαν Syh^m— nemo pertransiet
La⁵³

σαββάτων 534

ὀνειδισμόν 22 36 48 51-51' 62 88
96 311 407 449 763 770 Syh The Arm

> 410

> 91 106 410 490 710 The

ὀνειδισμόν A S 544

ἁβραάμ 22 36 48 51-51'

62 88 96 311 407 449 763 770 Syh The Arm

α' + καὶ εἰς ρομφαίαν Syh^m> καὶ εἰς κατάρασιν ἔση ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς
καὶ πᾶσαι 410επι 86^m

29:14

κατάρασιν

καταραν ASV 49 87 90 91 106 239 490 538 544 613 764
 επικαταρασιν 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449 763 770
 Chr. The καταπαουσιν 46 631 επικαταραν 88

ἔσῃ

εσει 239 > 710 της Chr ~ Sylh
 + βοσop 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311
 407 449 763 770 Chr(-wp) Thl (-wp)

ἐν

εμ A 91 544

in parte La^{Ss}οι γ' εσται βοσop 86^mοι λ' — " — Sylh^m

μέσω

μεση 233 μετω 490
 ο' μερει 86^m

+ μερους 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407
 449 763 770 Chr Thl Arm + μερη 88 Sylh

αὐτῆς

tua La^{Ss} + συνημμενας Chr^{comm.}

καὶ

πάντα αἱ

πασε ε S*

πόλεις

πολεις S* civitates La^{Ss}

αὐτῆς

αυτων 534 Arab Arm tuae La^{Ss}

ἔσονται

εσοντε S*

ἐρημοί

> ερημοι εις κωνα 407

εἰς

εως αιωνος 22 36
 48 51^s 62 96 311 763

α' σ' εσονται

εις ερημιας

αιωνιους 86^m

αἰῶνα

pr. τον AQ 49 87 90 91 233
 410 490 538 613 764 Arab
 αιωνας 88 51 449 770 Sylh

εως του αιωνος
 Thl

29:15

Ἀκοὴν

> 410

ἤκουσα παρὰ

κυρίου

pr. ^{του} 22 36 48 51^s 62 96 311 407 763

καὶ ἀγγέλους

÷ και 86

εἰς

α' περιοχή εν
τοῖς ἔθνεσιν
ἀπεσταλὴ 86^{mg}

ἔθνη

pr. τα V 239 538 Tht ^{comm.} Bas N

ἀπέστειλε,

-λεν ABQS^c (-τιλεν) 22* 26 48 51^{B*} 86
87 88 91' (-λα 91*) 96 233 239 311 407 449
490 544 710 763 770 Bas N -λεν 62
ἐξαπέστειλεν 49 90(-λε) 534 613(-λε) 764

α' και πρεσβευτης
εις εθνη απεσταλη
Syn^{mg}

συνάχθητε,

pr. dicens La^{Sg} συναχθῆναι S* 407(+τε)
συναχθῆται S^c 534

καὶ

παραγίνεσθε

-θαί A S 26 86 407 534 544
-γινεσθε 106 239 538 Bas N

εἰς

επ 22 36 48 51-51^s 96 311 449 763 770
Tht La^{Sg} (adversum) Acc^B Syn^{mg}

> 407

εν αυτη 62

αὐτήν,

ἀνάστητε

pr. και 22 36 48 51 62 88 96 106 311 449 534 763
770 Tht Bo Acc^B Arm^m

εἰς πόλεμον.

+ επ αυτην 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449
763 770 Tht Syn^{mg}

29:16-17

Μικρόν

πρ. ιδου A Q V 22 36 48 51-51^s 96 86 130 233 239
 311 407 449 534 544 613 710 763 770 The Olymp
 πρ. οτι ιδου 62 88 * Sylh Arm (+ ego) et Aeth
 α'σ' * οτι μικρον 86^m

ἔδωκά

δεδωκα A 22 26 36 48 51-51^s 62 (δεδο.)
 96 233 311 407 449 763 770 The

εδωκας
 239 544 Bas N

σε

ἐν

ἐθνέσιν

-σι 88 90^c 239 410 613 Bas N

εὐκαταφρόνητον

πρ. και A 49 87 88 90 91 239 410 490
 613 764 Bas N Sylh Arab - φρονιτον 86
 > 763 α'σ' εξουδενωμενον Sylh^m

α' εν τοις
 εθνέσιν εξ-
 ουδενωμενον εν
 ανθρωποις 86^m

ἐν

> 311

ἀνθρώποις.

+ ευκαταφρονητον 763

v.17 Ἡ

> 311

παιγνία

πλεγ. S* α'θ' υπερηφανια Sylh^m

α' αλαζοσυνη
 σου επηρεν σε 86^m

σου

πρ. της καρδιας 51 449 770

ἐνεχείρησέ

-σεν A B Q S (-χιρ. S*) V 49 91 233 490 538
 544 764 επεχειρισεν 26 534 (-ρησεν)
 ενεχειρισε 36 46 51 88 106 239 311 449 613^c
 770 Sylh
 ενεχειρισεν 22* (-σε^c) 48 51* (-σε 51ⁱ) 87 96
 407 710 763

σ' αλαζονια
 σου επηρεν σε
 86^m Sylh^m

σοι

+ ταυτα 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 *88 96 311
 407 449 763 770 The Sylh^m Arm

29:17

ἰταμία

pt. η 51 88 233 239 311 407 449 770 B_{an} N
 ιταμιαν Q ηταμια 106 490 ιταμοτις 534
 ιταμιον 544 ἡι ταμικια αὐτης 62
 και η ατιμια 22 36 48 51^s 96 763
 duritia B_o stultitiam La^s₃
 ματια Aeth α' θλιψις Συη^{ms}

καρδίας

pt. της 22 36 48 51 96 311 407 449 763
 770 Thē καρδια V 68 106 122 239

σου

κατέλυσε

-σεν A B Q S V 22 26 36 48 49
 51^s 62 86 87 88 91 96 311 407 490 544
 710 763 764 Thē κατελιπε 239

α' κατα-
 σκηνοῦντες
 εν οπαις Συη^{ms}

α' σ'
 υπερηφανια
 της καρδιας
 σου κατη-
 σκηνοῦντας
 εν οπαις
 των πετρων
 επιλαμ-
 βανομενους
 υψους βουνου
 86^{ms}

τρυμαλίας

-λειας A τρυμμ. 26 -ματειας 534
 εν τρυμαλιας 22 36 48 51^s 62 88
 96 311 407 763 Thē La^s₃ (in cavernis)

σ' επιλαμ-
 βανομενοι
 της πετρης Συη^{ms}

κατελυσεν εν
 τρυμαλιας
 πετρων Συη^{ms}

πετρῶν

συνέλαβεν

-λαβε 239 B_{an} N -λαβον 22^s 48 407 763 Thē

ἰσχυὺν

÷ 86 επι 407 munitionem La^s₃

βουνου

θ' υψος
 βουνου Συη^{ms}

ὑψηλοῦ.

÷ 86 ομοιως οι γ' 86^{ms}
 + σου Arm

ὅτι

ὑψωσεν

υψωσας 49 87 90 91 106 490 764 La^s₃ (halletti) Aeth^s Arm^s
 εαν υψωσεις A 26 86^{ms} 239
 εαν υψωσης Q V 22 36 46 48 51-51^s 62 86^{txt} 88 96 130
 233 311 407 449 534 544 613 710 763 770

29:17-18

ὥσπερ

ws 106 233 538 Tht

ἀετός

νοσσιάν

-ειαν B* νοσιαν 62 88 534 pl. Bo

αὐτοῦ,

σου A 22 36 48 51-51' 62 88 96 106 239 311 407
449 763 770 86^{ms} Tht La^S (tuum) Acch^B Syr Arab Arm
εαυτου S 534

ἐκεῖθεν

εκιθεν S* pr. et Arm } εκει ο Θς καθελη 534

καθελῶ

σε.

σαι A + φησι κυριος 22(-σιν) 36 48(-σιν)
51-51' 62 88 96 311 407(-σιν) 449 763 770 Syr Arm
= ο' 86^{ms} + λεγει κυριος Tht

v. 18 καὶ

ἔσται

εστε S*

ἡ

> 46 631

ἰδουμαία

ιουμαια S* ιουδομαια 68

εἰς

βατον S* } sine vestigio La^S

ἄβατον,

πᾶς

pr. και Q Bo Arab Arm pr. quia Acch^B

ο

> 26

παρὰ πορευόμενος

πορευομενος 311 410

29: 18-19

ἐπ'

την 239

δι αὐτης 534
per eam La^{sg}

αὐτήν

αὐτη 51 311 407 449 770

συριεῖ.

ἐκοιτησεται και συριεῖ ἐπὶ παση τῇ πληγῇ
(πασαν τὴν πληγὴν Q 239 ^{bas N} 613) αὐτης Q V 22 26
36 46 48 51-51^s 62 86 88 96 233 239 311 407 449 534
544 613 631 710 763 770 S_{gh}
+ ἐκοιτησεται και συριεῖ ἐπὶ (ἐν 87^{tt}) παση
τῇ πληγῇ αὐτης 49 87 90 91 490 764

ν. 19 ὥσπερ

ως V 22 26 36 46 48 51-51^s 62 86 88 96 233 311
407 449 534 544 631 710 763 770

κατεστράφη

Σόδομα και

Γόμορρα

-ορα 88 239

και

αἱ

ε 5* 62
οι 88 613

vicinae eius
civitates La^{sg}

πάροικοι

-οικικαι 106

αὐτῆς,

+ sic subvertam te
La^{sg}

α' και ε (αι^c)
γειτονες αὐτης
εἶπε κυριος
86^{ms}

εἶπε

-εν ABQSV 22* 26 48 49 62 86 87 88 90
96 233 311 407 449 490 534 544

κύριος

πανταράτωρ

÷ Q' ÷ 86 ÷ 88 + S_{gh} > Argm

29:19-20

οὐ

pr. et Arch Arm

μὴ

> 26

καθίσκει

κατοικήσει A καθίσκει BQS 22 46 48 51-51^s
 62 86 87 88 90 96 130 311 407 410 449 490 538 544 613
 631 710 763 764 770 καθίσκει 26 91
 καθίσκει 36 534 68 122^{*}

ἐκεῖ

ἐκεῖ S^{*}

ἄνθρωπος,

ἄνθρωπος S^{*}

} ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ 613

καὶ οὐ μὴ

κατοικήσει

καθίσκει A ενοικήσει BS^c(-σι S^{*}) Olymp
 ενοίκηση Q 130 239 538 613 BasN
 κατοίκηση 22 36 46 48 49 51-51^s 86 87 88 90 96 106
 311 407 410 449 534 544 631 710 763 764 770

ἐκεῖ

ἐκεῖ S^{*}> 88 S^{yh} ^{txt}

υἱός

ἄνθρώπου.

v.20 ἰδοὺ

ὥσπερ

ως 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 88 96 311 407 449 763 770
 Chr Greg Nyss III, p. 232

λέων

ἀναβήσεται

29:20

ἐκ

μέσου

τοῦ

ἰορδάνου

του υδατος S*

α' εκ φρυγματος του
ιορδανου 86^{ms}σ' απο της δοξης
86^{ms} (sub σ' α' sed α' del.^c) 86^{ms}

εἰς

τόπον

Αιθῶν,

pt. τον A 538

ηθαμ A εθαμ 62 544 Chr
αιμαθ 36^c 49 88 90 91 490 613
764 86^{ms} (πηπ) εμαθ 87α' στερεαν } Eus. Onom. p. 38
σ' αρχαιανα' στερρον } Shiller, II. p. 862
σ' αρχαιατο ἑβραϊκόν εθαμ Chr^{com.}α' επι το κατοικητηριον
το αρχαιον 86^{ms}ιω' επι το κατοικητηριον
το ωχυρωτοτον 86^{ms}α' προς ευπρεπειαν
στερεαν 86^{ms}σ' επι το κατοικητηριον
των αρχων 86^{ms}

ὅτι

ταχὺ ἐκδιώξω

αὐτούς

ἀπ' αὐτῆς,

καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους

ἐπ'

αὐτήν

ἐπιστήσατε.

ταχυς και διωξω 22 36 48 51^s 96 311 763

> 239 Bas N Bo

> S* 106^{*}αυτης Q^{txt} S + 86^{ms}-σεται A -ται 764
-σω 86^{ms} 86^{ms}+ και τις εκλεκτος προς αυτην επισκεψομαι 22 36
48 51-51' 62 96 311 407 * 449 763 * 770και τις εκλεκτος
προς αυτην
επισκεψομαι
88 86^{ms} ^{txt} Arg

÷ 86

σ' και τις εκ-
λεκτος προς αυτην
επισκεψομαι 86^{ms}
(επ 62)α' οτι κατασπευσω
αυτον τροχασω αυτον
επαινωθεν αυτης
και τις εκλεκτος
προς αυτην επι-
σκεψομαι 86^{ms}σ' εξαιφνης δραμειν
ποιησω αυτον
επαινωθεν αυτης
και τινες εκλεκτον
επ αυτην επιστησω
86^{ms}

29:20-21

ὅτι

και 62 vel Arm > Arab

τίς

ὥσπερ

ως 538

ἐγώ; καὶ τίς

ἀντιστήσεται

- ετε S^x

μοι;

μου 26

καὶ

> 233 The

τίς

οὗτος

est B_o

ποιμὴν,

pr. o S 130 410. The B_o Arab

ὅς

o A ως V οστις 26 538

στήσεται

στησται B^x συστήσεται 538κατὰ πρόσωπόν
μου;v.21 Διὰ τοῦτο
ἀκούσατε

βουλὴν

pr. την 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 The

κυρίου, ἣν

ἐβουλεύσατο

fecit Sa^u

ἐπὶ τὴν

α' οτι τις ομοιος
μοι και τις
υποστησεται μοι
86^mα' σ' ομοιος μοι
και τις υποστησεται
μοι Syn^m

> Clem

29:21

ἰδουμαιαν

μεαν S* B₀

καὶ

λογισμὸν

α' σ' και τους λογισμους αυτου 8^{ms}

αὐτοῦ,

> S^{a we}

ὅν

ἐλογίσατο

- γεισατο S

ἐπὶ τοὺς
κατοικοῦντας

Θαιμάν.,

Θεμαν 87 B₀ A^{ce} A^{gm} Θεμαν Arab
pt. in B₀ S^{a we} α' θ' Θεμαν 8^{ms}

ἐάν

μή

> V 544

συμψησθῶσι

συνψηφισθωσιν A 51. 88 (-σι) 311 407 449 490 513 (-
544 770 συνψηθωσιν B* συμψηθωσι B^c 130
συνψηφισθωσιν Q 46 (-σι) 51^s 62 (συνψι.) 106 (-σι)
613 (-σι) 631 (-σι) συνωσιν S 410 (-σι) S^{a we}
συνψισθωσιν V 91 (-σι) 534 (-σι)
συνψησθωσιν 22 26 36 48 49 51^{s*} 87 96 763 764
σ' συμψησωσιν αυτους 8^{ms}
+ .x. αυτω Q^{ms} + αυτων 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311
407 449 763 770 8^{ms}

τὰ ἐλάχιστα

των ελαχιστων προβατα 106

τῶν

α' ελαχιστα του ποιμενου 8^{ms}

προβάτων

σ' ποιμενων 8^{ms}

29:21-22

ἐὰν μὴ

ἀβρωθῇ

βρωθῇ 239

ἐπ'

αὐτοῦς

αὐτῇ A αὐτῇ B S* 106 130 410 538 B₀ Acta
αὐτῆς S^c 26} > S^{W_c} Arm

κατάλυσις

- σεις 544

αὐτῶν,

v. 22 ὅτι> Q V 22 26 46 48 51-51^s 86 88 96 233 311 407
449 534 544 631 710 763 770 S_h Arm

ἀπὸ φωνῆς

} > 62

πτώσεως

ιππεων 130 α' σεισμου S_h^{ms}

αὐτῶν

αὐτοῦ Arm^{1st}

ἐφοβήθη

εσισθη A 407 544 εσεισθη Q V 22 26 36
46 48 51-51^s 62 86 87 88 90 91 96 130 233 239 311
449 490 534 613 631 710 763 764 770

ἡ γῆ,

+ αὐτων B₀

καὶ

> Q V 22 26 36 46 48 51-51^s 62 86 88 96 130 233 311
407 449 534 544 631 710 763 770 S_h S^{W_c} Arm
> καὶ κραυγὴ σου ἐν θαλάσῃ ἠκούσθη 538

κραυγὴ

κραυγῇ S*

σου

> B S Acta ητις 534 αὐτων B₀

ἐν

> B S Acta

} εουκί 544

29:22-23

Θαλάσση

Θαλάσσης BS Αεα^β + ερυθρα 22 36 48
 51^ο-51^ς 62 88 96 311 407 449 763 770 Syl Arm
 = οι γ' ο' 86^{mg}

ἡκούσθη

π. ουκ BS Αεα^β ΕΞΗΚΟΥΣΘΗ V 22 36 36
 46 48 51^ο-51^ς 62 88 96 311 407 449 544 631 763 770 Syl
 + φωνη σου 22 36 48 51^ς 96 763
 + η φωνη σου 51 62 311 407 449 770 Syl^{mg} Arm
 + η φωνη αυτης 88 Syl^{tst}

v.23 ἴδου ὥστερ

ἀέτος

αετος αετος 449 + qui Αεα^β

ὄψεται

-ετε S^{*} V αναβησεται 22 36 48 51-51^ς 62 96
 311 407 449 763 770 = α'σ' 86^{mg} Syl^{mg}
 + και επιστησεται 22 36 48 96 311 763
 + και επιπτησεται 51-51^ς 62(-σσεται) * 88 407 449
 770 * Syl Arm = σ' * 86^{mg}

καὶ

ἐκτενεί

εκτενι AS^{*} εκτεινει B^{*} εκτενη 544
 εκτενις 710

τὰς

πτέρυγας

χειρας 544 Arab + αυτου 22 36 48 49 51-51^ς
 62 87 90 91 96 311 407 449 490 534 613 763 764
 770 Syl B Αεα^β Arab Arm

ἐπ'

επι 22 36 48 51-51^ς 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 } επι βοοορα
 απ 490 } 86^{mg}

ὀχυρώματα

π. τα 22 36 48 51-51^ς 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 } α'σ' επι βοορα
 μασιν 534 } Syl^{mg}
 μα 233 710

αὐτῆς καὶ

29:23

ἔσται

-τε S*

ἡ καρδία

τῶν

ἰσχυρῶν

> Q^{ut}

εχθρῶν 534

τῆς

ἰδουμίας

> 22

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

ἐκείνη,

ἐκινῆ S*

ὡς καρδία

γυναικὸς

} ρ. Arm

ὠδινούσης

ὠδει. B*

III. Grouping of the Evidence

Collation of all the manuscript, patristic and versional evidence above has revealed a host of variant readings for Jer 29. While initial survey of these pages might present a very confused picture indeed, further study soon reveals the existence of certain patterns of attestation within the variants, and these patterns tend to reduce the apparent confusion considerably. Of prime importance is the fact that some MSS consistently group together in bearing witness to the same reading. This phenomenon of the grouping of MSS has long been recognized as a foundational principle in the work of textual criticism, in the case of LXX studies going back at least to the works of A.M. Ceriani (Monumenta, II, 1863, xxiv), J. Wellhausen (Text, 1871, pp. 223f.) and Paul de Lagarde (Pars Prior, 1883, p. xvi).¹⁴ In our analysis of Jer 29 the several groupings of MSS provides both a practical way of organizing the discussion as well as a useful means of surveying the textual history of this chapter of the book of Jer, and by extension--with certain modifications--¹⁵ of the whole book. The following six groups are found to exist in Jer: A) The O Group, B) The L Group, C) The C Group, D) The Q Group, E) The A Group, and F) The B Group.

A. The O Group (or Hexaplaric Recension)

The text-critical analysis of the oracles against the Philistines and Edom is most conveniently approached through the MSS attesting the recension of Origen, i.e., the text which derives ultimately from the fifth column of Origen's monumental Hexapla, hence also called the Hexaplaric recension.¹⁶ What makes the study of this recension especially suitable as a point of departure is the fact that it is firmly anchored historically, and thanks to Origen's own comments on his modus operandi in revising the LXX, its readings are often readily identified.¹⁷ A key passage explaining the principles underlying this recension is found in Origen's Commentary on Matthew (xv, 14), where commenting on a textual problem in Matt 19:19, he says:

Great differences have arisen in the transcripts, from the carelessness of some of the scribes, or from the recklessness of some persons, or from those who neglected the emendation of the text, or else from those who made additions to the text or omissions from it, as they thought fit. With the help of God's grace I have tried to repair the disagreements in the copies of the Old Testament on the basis of the other versions. When I was uncertain of the Septuagint reading because the various copies did not tally, I settled the issue by consulting the other versions and retaining what was in agreement with them. Some passages did not appear in the Hebrew; these I marked with an obelus as I did not dare to leave them out altogether. Other passages I marked with an asterisk to show that they were not in the Septuagint but that I had added them from the other versions in agreement with the Hebrew text.¹⁸

Three relevant facts emerge from the above passage: 1) Origen purposed to amend the LXX by bringing it into conformity with the Hebrew; 2) He used other Gk versions to settle points of inner-Gk corruption in existing LXX MSS as well as to supply passages he considered missing in the LXX; 3) He employed a conventional system of critical signs to indicate omissions and additions in the LXX vis-à-vis the Hebrew: the obelus to mark a reading found in the LXX but not in the Hebrew, the asterisk to draw attention to a reading missing in the LXX but added by him from the other versions.¹⁹

Of the three points mentioned here, the use of the critical signs is the most arresting feature of Origen's work, providing us frequently with a visual means of identifying the readings that belong to his recension.²⁰ For the prophetical books in general and for Jer in particular the most frequent carriers of the critical signs are the following four MSS: Codex Chisianus (MS88), Codex Ambrosianus, containing the text of the Syrohexapla (Syh), Codex Barberinus (MS 86), and Codex Marchalianus (Q). Of these four, a unique pair is formed by 88 and Syh; various factors combine to demonstrate not only their sister relationship but also their Hexaplaric origin.

The common ancestry of 88 and Syh is shown in at least five ways. Both attest the same unusual order of the prophetical books: Jer, Dan, Ez, Is. Only these two MSS transmit the LXX text of Daniel (where all others, apart from some fragments in the Chester Beatty papyri, give Theodotion's version), and arrange the story of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon after the canonical

part of Daniel (in this respect accompanied by MS 62). In Jer only they, together with most of the MSS of the L group, follow the Hebrew text in the matter of the location and internal order of the oracles against foreign nations. Finally, the similar (sometimes identical) colophons are a strong witness to their common background.

It is to the colophons, too, that we owe specific information concerning the Hexaplaric origin of 88 and Syh. For instance, the colophon for Lamentations reads as follows: *Θρηνοὶ (gr. τετέλονται Syh) Ἱερειμίου· ἔγγραφη ἐκ τῶν ἑξαπλῶν ἐξ ὧν καὶ παρετίθη.* Whether by the phrase *ἔγγραφη ἐκ τῶν ἑξαπλῶν* is meant that the text was originally copied out of the Hexapla autograph or from some transcript of the fifth column (whether by Origen himself or by his friends Pamphilus and Eusebius) cannot be determined. In the case of the Syh, internal evidence shows that this was translated from a Gk MS almost identical to the forerunner of 88 (cf. their mutual agreement in the omission of several asterisks). By the phrase *ἐκ ὧν [i.e. τῶν ἑξαπλῶν] καὶ παρετίθη* is probably meant that the text was provided with the Origenic signs. Although no colophon exists for Jer (Ziegler thinks it may have dropped out by accident, cf. *Ieremias* p. 67), we may assume that what is said concerning Lamentations applies equally to Jer. Since the history of these two MSS is so clearly related and since their common readings and signs unequivocally place them in the Origenic camp, their mutually attested readings may legitimately be cited under the symbol O (=Origen).

There is one major difference between 88 and the Syh, namely that in addition to its fifth column text, Syh also has numerous readings in its margins taken mainly--though not exclusively--from the other columns of the Hexapla and identified by the symbols *α'*, *σ'*, *θ'*, *ω'*, *οιλ'*. In this respect Codex Marchalianus (Q) and Codex Barberinus (86) resemble the Syrohexapla for, while the text itself of these MSS does not derive from Origen's recension, their margins are nevertheless rich sources of Hexapla readings, including some from the fifth column text. MS 86 also contains a number of critical signs, especially obeli, in the body of its text, but as we shall see, many of these are unreliable.²¹

With the above modicum of historical and MS background in hand it becomes possible to proceed with a detailed examination of the Hexaplaric recension of Jer 29. The goal in view is to isolate those readings which can with reasonable certainty be attributed to Origen's recension as secondary additions or alterations and to disqualify such from a restored archetype text of Jer 29. The material will be dealt with according to the following outline:

1. Obelised Readings
 - a. Agreeing with MT
 - b. Conflicting with MT
2. Asterised Readings
 - a. Agreeing with MT
 - b. Conflicting with MT
3. Unmarked Readings
 - a. Supported by Hexapla Readings
 - i. Additions
 - ii. Synonymous Substitutions
 - iii. Double Readings
 - b. Unsupported by Hexapla Readings
4. Significance of the Data

1. Obelised Readings

There are altogether nine obelised readings in our extant MS evidence for the oracles against the Philistines and Edom. The obeli take three different forms: ÷, ¯, ∞. ²² Taking MT as the comparative base, six of the obeli agree with Origen's known working principles while three disagree.

a. Obelised Readings Agreeing with MT

29:1 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους } ρ. ∞ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφυλοὺς[✓]
 * λόγος κυρίου ὡς ἐγενήθη πρὸς ἱερεμῖαν τὸν προφήτην[✓] Σγμ;
 ρ. ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφυλοὺς ὡς ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου
 πρὸς ἱερεμῖαν τὸν προφήτην 51 62 311 449 770

The Syh (followed by minuscules 51 62 311 449¹) reproduce the phrase ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους twice, once as a title in common with all other LXX MSS, and once as part of the longer introductory formula corresponding to MT. It may well be that Syh has preserved the right Hexaplaric tradition here, namely that when Origen came to the LXX title ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους, he merely obelised this and proceeded to add from the younger versions the words missing in the LXX (contrast 88 which has the title ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους only once preceded by the phrase ὅς ἐγενήθη λόγος κυρίου πρὸς ἱερ. τὸν προφήτην, see below p. 62).

29:5 καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι] ÷ καὶ 86

The MT תִּשְׁלֹשׁ also omits the article.

29:9 ἐν Δαδαν] ÷ ἐν 86

The MT יַדְיָ also omits the preposition. The omission of ἐν in Q^{txt} is probably accidental.

29:17 ἰσχὺν βουνοῦ ὑψηλοῦ] ÷ ἰσχυρ βουνου ÷ ὑψηλου 86

Cf. MT 49:16 הַיָּבֵל הַגָּדֹל

It is not clear how the two obeli are to be explained; probably only one goes back to Origen. The Gk translation equivalence furthest removed from the Heb is ἰσχὺν and may therefore have been the word obelised by Origen. An interesting note in 86^{mg} comments with reference to ὑψηλοῦ, "ὁμοίως οἱ γ' ", perhaps intended as a scribal remark defending the retention of the word.

29:19 κύριος παντοκράτωρ] ÷ παντοκράτωρ Q O 86

MT has only יהוה.

29:20 καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστήσατε] ÷ 86;
om. 88-Syh^{txt}

Cf. MT 49:19 תַּרְנֶנֶן הַיָּלֵךְ הַיָּבֵל הַגָּדֹל

The phrase sub obeli in 86 has been entirely suppressed in 88-Syh^{txt} and replaced by a phrase which better corresponds to MT (see below p. 67).

b. Obelised Readings Conflicting with MT

The above six readings have confirmed the general correspondence between MT and Origen's Heb text. In the following three examples of obelised readings conflicting with MT we have to reckon with a Heb text differing from the MT or with incorrectly transmitted obeli.

29:3 $\pi\omicron\delta\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\} \div \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \ 86$
Cf. MT 47:3 ן־ר־ב־נ

The obelus before $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is a problem since the MT also has the third per. sing. suffix. A different Heb Vorlage is a technical possibility, but it may be that the obelus originally stood before $\pi\omicron\delta\omega\nu$ since this word in no way agrees with the Heb; in O $\pi\omicron\delta\omega\nu$ was replaced by $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omega\nu$ (see below, p. 71). These facts may mean that in the fifth column both words were present (i.e., $\pi\omicron\delta\omega\nu$ and $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omega\nu$), the first one sub obeli, the second sub asterisco, only the latter of which (minus the asterisk) has survived in O.²³

29:14 $\epsilon\prime\sigma\eta\} \sim \text{Syh}$
Cf. MT 49:13 ה־ה־ת

It is doubtful that this obelus is correctly preserved in Syh since $\epsilon\prime\sigma\eta$ exactly corresponds to ה־ה־ת and the Heb sentence can hardly be conceived of without the verb. Ziegler (Ieremias, p. 79) may well be right in suggesting that the obelus originally stood before the phrase which immediately follows $\epsilon\prime\sigma\eta$, namely $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega$. In O this phrase constitutes the first part of a double reading $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega / \mu\acute{\iota}\epsilon\eta$ (see below p. 71). In the fifth column $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega$ would presumably have been sub obeli and $\mu\acute{\iota}\epsilon\eta$ sub asterisco.

29:15 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \ \alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\} \div \kappa\alpha\iota\ \ 86$
Cf. MT 49:14 ך־ג־ו

Since both the LXX and the MT have the conjunction, the obelus is enigmatic. Perhaps the conjunction was missing in Origen's Heb Vorlage and the obelus is then correctly transmitted.

Alternatively, the obelus may be intended to apply to both words, καὶ ἀγγέλους, thus drawing attention to the discrepancy between the Gk plural and the Heb singular.

Remarks

The best attested obelus in our chapter is παντοκράτωρ in 29:19 (Q 0 86). This word was certainly present in the pre-Origenic text. This is namely the function of a true obelus for the modern text critic, that it guarantees that reading for the pre-Origenic text.

Six of the nine obelised passages are attested only by MS 86, and at least two of these are open to question. The preponderance of obeli in 86 is a phenomenon of that MS in Jer (cf. Ieremias, p. 76); the presence of several anomalous obeli is also characteristic of that MS (cf. Ieremias, p.78).

Only in one case (29:20) has an obelised reading been entirely suppressed in some other MS. This low frequency of elimination is in conformity with a general reluctance on the part of scribes altogether to omit Origen's obelised passages.

2. Asterised Readings

Fourteen asterised readings have been preserved in the extant MSS of Jer 29. Eleven of these agree with the MT, while three conflict with MT.

In this section the relevant data for the asterised readings is set out in columns in the following manner: In the centre of the page, straddling the two columns, is reproduced the reading of the collation text. In the left-hand column is cited the asterised reading in question followed by the corresponding Hexapla readings under appropriate translator symbols (where available). In the right-hand column, for comparison purposes, are listed those Gk MSS containing the same (or very similar) readings as those which in the left-hand column are under asterisk.

a. Asterised Readings Agreeing with MT

29:1 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους

ργ. ∞ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφυλοὺς
 ✕ λόγος κυρίου ὅς ἐγενήθη
 πρὸς ἱερεμῖαν τὸν προφήτην 54h

ργ. ✕ ὅς ἐγενήθη λόγος κυρίου
 πρὸς ἱερεμῖαν ✕ τὸν προφήτην 88

+ ✕ πρὸ τοῦ παταξαι φαραῶ
 (✕ 88) τὴν γάζαν Q^{mg} 88-54h

α' σ' ργ. ✕ ὅς ἐγενήθη λόγος
 κυρίου πρὸς ἱερεμῖαν τὸν προφήτην
 Q^{mg}

α' σ' ργ. ✕ ὅς ἐγενήθη λόγος
 κυρίου πρὸς ἱερεμῖαν τὸν προφήτην
 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφυλοὺς (α' πρὸς
 φυλιστίους 54h^{mg}; σ' περὶ τῶν
 φυλιστιαίων 86^{mg}) πρὸ τοῦ παταξαι
 φαραῶ τὴν γάζαν 86^{mg}

+ ὅς ἐγενέτο λόγος κυρίου
 πρὸς ἱερεμῖαν τὸν προφήτην
 (+ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφυλοὺς 51 62
 311 449 770) πρὸ τοῦ παταξαι
 φαραῶ τὴν γάζαν 22 36 48
 51 51^s 62 96 311 407 449 763 770

MT 47:1 לֹא הָיָה דְבַר יְהוָה
 יְרֵמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא לֹא כָּל־שָׁמַע
 בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה כִּי יֵצֵא

The long introductory formula in MT is represented in the LXX only by the phrase ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους. Aquila and Symmachus, however, supplied the missing parts before and after the short title corresponding to the Heb, from where it was taken over by Origen and placed sub asterisco.

The asterised additions in 88 and Syh are identical except for the transposition of the opening phrase ὅς ἐγενήθη / λόγος κυρίου. The order in 88 is undoubtedly original to the Hexaplaric recension as it agrees with α' σ' and with MT. In that part of the asterised addition following the title (πρὸ τοῦ πατάξαι φαραὼ τὴν γάζαν), 88-Syh are joined anonymously by Q^{mg}. But since the additions in Q^{mg} preceding the title are under the symbols α' σ', it is likely that the addition following the title is to be regarded as a continuation of the reading under the same symbols, i.e. α' σ'. The additional asterisks in 88 before τὸν προφήτην and τὴν γάζαν are of uncertain significance.

<u>29:4</u>	<u>πάντας</u>
pr. * συν 88	pr. συν 86 ^{mg}
MT 47:4 לְכָל הָעָם	

The preposition σύν is a tell-tale sign of Aquila's translation. In that version σύν renders the Heb nota accusativi whenever the latter is followed by the Heb article or by לְ (as here); otherwise the Gk article alone is used (cf. Reider, Prolegomena, p. 16, n. 33). The appearance of the asterised σύν in 88 raises the question to what extent Origen adopted Aquila's fastidious rendering in the fifth column of the Hexapla. If 88 is to be trusted, he did so rather frequently (115 times in Jeremiah according to Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 72).²⁴

<u>29:4</u>	<u>τοὺς κατάλοιπους (2°)</u>
pr. * τοὺς αλλοφύλους ○	pr. τοὺς αλλοφύλους 22 36 (+ και) 48 51 51 ^s 62 (tr. τοὺς αλλ./ τοὺς καταλ.) 96 311 407 449 763 770
α' θ' pr. * τοὺς αλλοφύλους Q ^{mg}	
σ' pr. * τοὺς αλλοφύλους 86 ^{mg}	

Cf. MT 47:4 תִּשְׁלַח יְדָיִךָ וְיִשְׁמַדוּן

The correspondence between MT and O is exact.

29:4

τῶν νήσων

+ * και καππαδοκίας 449 770

+ και καππαδοκίας O 22

36 48 51 51^f 62 96 311 407 763

α' θ' + * και καππαδοκίας Q^{mg}

οι γ' + καππαδοκας 86^{mg}

Cf. MT:4 כִּנְיֵי כְּפַת־יָם

Although the asterisk in 449 770 is found in the margin of these MSS, it is clear from a comparison with the other MSS that it applies to καὶ καππαδοκίας. It is true that this addition generally corresponds to the Heb כְּפַת־יָם, but two things must be noted: "Cappadocia" is not a correct translation of כְּפַת־יָם, nor does the Heb have the conjunction. How are these discrepancies to be explained?

With regard to the absence of the conjunction in the Heb, it is interesting to note the reading of The Three (καππαδόκας) in 86^{mg} which also omits the article and may therefore represent the better tradition from the Hexapla, in contrast to the witness of Q^{mg} according to which Aquila and Theodotion attest the conjunction (but καππαδόκας--acc. pl.--in 86^{mg} must be wrong since the sense definitely requires a genitive; the loss of the iota may be accidental). The reading of the younger versions would then have been τῶν νήσων καππαδοκίας, "the islands of Cappadocia." But whence then the καί in O . . . 770? Possibly it entered the text at a later stage to correct the geographical absurdity of the phrase "the islands of Cappadocia", Cappadocia neither being an island nor having any! (The correct translation of כְּפַת־יָם is probably Crete). By the simple addition of a καί geographical credibility is restored to the verse: "the Lord will destroy the rest of the islands and (the rest of) Cappadocia."

29:8κύριος+ * των δυναμεων Q^m+ των δυναμεων O 22 36
48 51 51^s 62 96 311 407 449
763 770o' + των δυναμεων 86^m

Cf. MT 49:7 טוֹנֵבָה הוּה־

The correspondence between the Gk additions and MT is exact.

29:11 ᾠλοντο διὰ χεῖρα* ᾠλετο σπέρμα αὐτοῦ διὰ
χεῖρα OCf. ᾠλετο διὰ χεῖρα Q^c
86^m 106 130ᾠλοντο] + * το σπέρμα αὐτοῦ
Q^mᾠλετο σπέρμα (pr. το 22 36
48 51^s 96 763) αὐτοῦ διὰ χεῖρα
22 36 48 51 51^s 62 96 311 407 449
763 770o' * ᾠλετο σπέρμα αὐτοῦ 86^m

Cf. MT 49:10

טוֹנֵבָה הוּה־

Since the common LXX reading ᾠλοντο διὰ χεῖρα misrepresents the Heb טוֹנֵבָה הוּה־ (mainly on account of the confusion of טוֹנֵבָה, "arm", and טוֹנֵבָה "seed"), Origen sought to correct the mistranslation. In place of διὰ χεῖρα he wrote σπέρμα αὐτοῦ and in place of the plural verb ᾠλοντο he placed the singular verb ᾠλετο. Since no reading of the younger versions has survived at this point, unfortunately we do not know the source of Origen's reading.

According to Origen's stated rules one would have expected the asterisk to have been placed in front of σπέρμα αὐτοῦ since that alone represents the addition to the LXX, ᾠλετο being a qualitative change. It is of course possible that the asterisk was moved in the process of transmission from a hypothetically original position preceding σπέρμα to that preceding ᾠλετο, but this is less likely in view of the stable position of the asterisk in both O

and 86^{mg}. If then the asterisk is correctly transmitted before $\dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$, this would tend to support the view that Origen occasionally used an asterisk to designate a qualitative as well as a quantitative change.²⁵

A further point of interest is the fact that in O the majority text reading of $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$ has been retained along with the asterised alteration and addition. We have here, therefore, a clear case of a double reading. Presumably in Origen's LXX column $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$ would have been sub obeli, but the obelus at some point has disappeared and both readings have been preserved side by side.²⁶

<u>29:13</u>	<u>$\dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$</u>
pr. $\dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\pi\iota\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ O	pr. $\pi\iota\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ 22 36 48 51 51 ^s
<hr/>	62 96 311 407 449 763 770
$\alpha'\theta'$ pr. $\dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\pi\iota\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ Q ^m	
$\omicron\iota\ \gamma'$ pr. $\dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\pi\iota\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ 86 ^m	
$\omicron\iota\ \lambda'$ pr. $\pi\iota\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ S ^g h ^m	
Cf. MT 49:12 $\iota\tau\psi\ \iota\tau\psi$	

In the LXX the Heb absolute infinitive was frequently rendered by the juxtaposition of a cognate participle and finite verb. This model had been followed by The Three in the translation of $\iota\tau\psi\ \iota\tau\psi$ (the minor discrepancies in attestation are of little consequence) and was in turn taken over from them by Origen.

<u>29:13</u>	<u>$\dot{\alpha}\theta\omega\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$</u>
+ $\dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\theta\omega\omega\theta\eta\sigma\eta$ O	+ $\alpha\theta\omega\omega\theta\eta\sigma\eta$ 22 36 48 51 ^s
<hr/>	.96 311 763
$\theta' + \dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\alpha\theta\omega\omega\theta\eta\sigma\eta$ 86 ^m	

Cf. MT 49:12 הַרְגוּהוּ

Whereas in the previous example the LXX lacked the participle in the translation of the Heb infinitive absolute, this time it was missing the finite verb. The verb was accordingly added by Origen from Theodotion.

<u>29:16</u>	<u>ἰδοὺ μικρόν</u>
pr. *· οτι [✓] 88 (om. signs) - Syh	pr. οτι 62
α'σ' *· οτι μικρόν 86 ^m	
Cf. MT 49:15 כִּי הִנֵּה הָרָג	

The correspondence between the O addition and MT is exact.

<u>29:20</u> <u>καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστήσατε</u> (÷ 86 ; om. 88-Syh ^{txt} ; hab. Syh ^m)	
+ *· και τις εκλεκτος προς αυτην επισκεψομαι 449 770	και τις εκλεκτος προς αυτην επισκεψομαι 88-Syh ^{txt}
α', ο' + και τις εκλεκτος προς αυτην επισκεψομαι 86 ^m	+ και τις εκλεκτος προς αυτην επισκεψομαι 22 36 48 51 51' 62 96 311 407 763

Cf. MT 49:19 וְהָיָה בְּהַרְגוֹתָם

This^{is} another case where the asterisk has been preserved only in MSS 449 770 (cf. 29:4 *· και καππαδοκίας above). The foregoing notation means that the LXX reading καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστήσατε (which is obelised in 86 and altogether missing in 88-Syh^{txt}) has been replaced in 88-Syh^{txt} by the reading from Aquila καὶ τίς ἐκλεκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπισκέψομαι which more closely approximates the Heb. In MSS 22 . . . 770 the new reading has been added to the old LXX reading, resulting in a double

reading in those MSS. The old LXX reading is also preserved in Syh^{mg}. The history of the passage, therefore, is probably as follows: The reading in Origen's Gk Vorlage was καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστήσατε. Since this phrase did not correspond to the Heb it was obelised by Origen (cf. the obelus in 86); at the same time he added the asterised correction καὶ τίς ἐκλεκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπισκέψομαι from Aquila.

29:23ὅψεται

+ ✕ καὶ ἐπιπτήσεται 0

Cf. αναβήσεται καὶ ἐπι-
στήσεται (ἐπιπτήσεται 51 51^s
62 407 449 770) 22 36 48 51 57^s
62 96 311 407 449 763 770

σ' + ✕ καὶ ἐπιπτήσεται 86^{mg}

Cf. MT 49:22 הַלֵּל וַיִּדְּהוּ

The LXX translation ὅψεται was occasioned by the misreading of ט for נ in הַלֵּל; the LXX has no corresponding word for הַלֵּל. By adding ἐπιπτήσεται from Symmachus (the latter's translation of הַלֵּל וַיִּדְּהוּ), Origen has succeeded in making his Gk text quantitatively equivalent to the Heb, but certainly not qualitatively equivalent, for the Heb הַלֵּל remains untranslated. The example illustrates the frequently noted tendency of Origen to strive more for quantitative agreement between the Heb and the Gk than qualitative agreement.²⁷

b. Asterised Readings Conflicting with MT

29:9ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν✕ 0 88 (- S₄₄)²⁸om. 0 S^c 130 410

Cf. MT וַיִּדְּהוּ

The reading ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν in the majority of LXX MSS for MT וַיִּדְּהוּ is one of the textual conundrums of the chapter.

If the asterisk prior to the Gk article is authentic to Origen's recension, it points to a pre-Origenic reading τόπος, αὐτῶν (cf. 130 410) to which Origen added the article, perhaps in conformity with the Heb נ of נננ, even though the rest of the Heb word in no way corresponds to τόπος, αὐτῶν. It has been argued that the words τόπος, αὐτῶν could in their turn be an inner-Gk corruption of an earlier reading τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (see discussion below, pp. 165 ff.). On the other hand, the asterisk may be faulty or employed as a scribal index to draw attention to a phrase which does not correspond to the Heb.

29:17סו

+ ✱ ταῦτα 88

+ ταῦτα 22 36 48 51 51' 62
96 311 407 449 763 770 S₇₄^m

Cf. MT 49:16 תתן

The addition of ταῦτα does not correspond to MT and the asterisk is not to be trusted as a genuine Origenic sign. For reasons to be explained later (see below, p.), the reading probably comes from MSS . . . 770.

22 λ

29:21συμψησθῶσι+ ✱ αὐτῶ Q^m+ αὐτῶν 22 36 48 51 51' 62
96 311 407 449 763 770 86^m

σ' + αὐτοῦς

Cf. MT 49:20 םבדב

It is doubtful that the Q^m reading αὐτῶ derives from Origen's recension. As in the previous example, the reading probably comes from MSS 22 . . . 770, the nun of αὐτῶν having dropped out (cf. the loss of the final nun of συνάτῶν in Q^m at 29:3).

Remarks

The Hexaplaric origin of the 11 asterised readings above which agree with MT is virtually certain. Not only do they agree with MT, but 10 of the 11 are also supported by readings from the various columns of the Hexapla (the only exception, 29:4 $\sigma\upsilon$ 88, we know on other grounds to derive from the Hexapla).

This section also gives the internal proof for the Hexaplaric origin of 88-Syh (in addition to the external evidence cited above pp. 54-57). Of the 11 asterised additions agreeing with MT, 6 are asterised in 88-Syh, one is asterised in 88 alone, another is asterised in Syh alone. The other three additions, while not asterised in 88-Syh, are nevertheless also attested by them (the asterisks, we assume, had already dropped out of their common ancestor).

On the question of the reliability of the signs, we note again (on the basis of the asterisks conflicting with MT) that not every sign is to be automatically trusted.

Four readings from 86^{mg} marked σ' are of special interest to us (29:4 σ' \times $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\phi\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, 29 σ' $\tau\omega\nu$ $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$ 29:11 σ' \times $\omega\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, 29:20 σ' $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\psi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$). The correspondence in each case between the σ' reading and 88-Syh makes it clear that the symbol σ' (= σ' $\epsilon\rho\delta\omicron\mu\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$) has reference to Origen's revised version of the LXX, specifically the fifth column text of the Hexapla. This conclusion is re-inforced by five additional such correspondences detailed in the next sub-section.

3. Unmarked Readings

In this section our attention focuses on readings in 88-Syh suspected of being Origenic but for which no signs have been preserved anywhere in the MS tradition. However, some of these unmarked readings do find support from Hexapla columns preserved in 86^{mg} and Q^{mg}. Others do not even enjoy this privilege and have to be judged Hexaplaric by inference only.

a. Supported by Hexapla Readings

i. Additions

29:14 εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν (tr. εἰς ἄβ. / εἰς ον.)
 O 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 } pr. εἰς
 ἀφανισμόν O 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449 763 770
 = o' 86^{mg} = MT

29:17 καθελῶ σε] + φησι(ν) κύριος O 22...770
 = o' 86^{mg} = MT

29:22 ἐν θαλάσῃ] + ἐρυθρὰ O 22...770 = o' γ', o' 86^{mg} = MT

ii. Double Reading

29:14 ἔση ἐν μέσῳ] + μέρη O (μερὺς 22...770);
 cf. μέρη o' 86^{mg}; MT תהיה בצרה

iii. Synonymous Substitutions

29:3 ποδῶν] δυνατῶν O 22...770 = θ' 86^{mg} Q^{mg};
 cf. MT אבריו

29:10 κατὰ λείμματα] καλαμίσματα O 22...770 = o' 86^{mg};
 cf. MT עוללות

The frequent correspondence in the above examples between O and o' in 86^{mg} (5x) is noteworthy. Such double attestation secures those readings for the Hexaplaric recension beyond doubt. In the case of the synonymous substitutions it is likely that no signs were ever employed for these.

b. Unsupported by Hexapla Readings

29:14 εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν] tr. αβατον /
 ονειδισμον O 22...770 = MT

29:22 ἤκουσθη] ἐξηκουσθη η φωνη (σου 22...770 ≠ MT)
 O 22...770 = MT

The above two examples repeat the same pattern of agreement between O and MT as observed previously. These readings are almost certainly Hexaplaric.

It does not follow, however, that these O readings necessarily exhaust the unmarked Hexaplaric readings present in our chapter. Any O reading which approximates MT or stands out against a majority of other Gk witnesses must be considered a candidate for Hexaplaric origin, though certain controls on this criterion will be discussed below, p.102. Some readings which fit into this category, but for a variety of reasons are more difficult to determine (e.g. O may in some instances have been influenced by other MSS) are the following:

29:4 ἀπολίσσαι] αφανισαι 88 (- S₇₄)

29:5 οἱ κατάλοιποι] τα λοιπα 88 (- S₇₄) 22...770 86^m

29:14 εἰς αἰῶνα] εις αιωνας O 51 449 770 ; cf. εως αιωνος
 22 36 48 51^s 62 96 311 407 763

29:15 ἀνάστητε] pr. και 88 22...770 106 534 = MT

29:17 ἐνεχρίρησεν] -ισεν 88 (- S₇₄) 22...770 46 87 106 239
 613^c 710

29:17 νοσσιᾶν αὐτοῦ] νο. σου O 22...770 A 106 239
 86^m = MT

29:23 πτέρυγας] + αουτου S₇₄ 22...770 534 613 = MT

4. Significance of the Data

The foregoing discussion has given ample proof of Origen's labours on the Gk text of Jer. While we cannot claim to possess a perfect copy of this revised text, yet the remarkable correspondences between Origen's known textual principles and many of the readings in 88-Syh, 86^{mg}, Q^{mg} suggests that in these sources we have at least a reasonably reliable witness to what the fifth column text of the Hexapla must have looked like. Many problems remain unresolved with regard to both the purpose and extent of Origen's revision, e.g. why he let some blatant mistranslations stand while correcting others less significant. But for our present purposes the really important question lies elsewhere, namely, in the extent to which Origen's revision has affected other MSS or text-traditions. Is it true, as Jerome suggests, that there hardly exists a Gk MS of the LXX which has not been affected by the Hexaplaric recension?³⁰ To what extent can Origen's influence be observed in the extant MS evidence for Jer, specifically in LXX Ch.29?

For the moment, this question can be answered only with regard to the confirmed Hexaplaric readings noted above. In the case of the unmarked O readings (i.e. those without critical signs) we do not possess as yet the criteria or a sufficiently broad base for deciding in every case the origin of these.³¹ But as for the assured Hexaplaric readings, a review of the previous pages shows that, apart from one persistent group of MSS, Origenic readings are rarely supported by other MSS. The exception is the group of MSS 22 36 48 51-51^B 48 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 which time and again support the same or similar reading as the Hexaplaric recension, so much so, in fact, that were it not for other considerations one might have thought that these MSS formed another witness to that recension. It is therefore to this group of MSS that our attention must turn next.

B. The L Group (or Lucianic Recension)

This section pursues the discussion of MSS 22 36 48 51-51^s 62 96 311 407 449 763 770 referred to above, (since 449 and 770 are almost identical, henceforth 449'=449-770). That these MSS constitute a homogeneous group (with some qualifications, see below pp.87-89) is clear not only from their frequent attestation of Hexaplaric readings, but also and especially on account of their several unique readings. It is of interest, therefore, to inquire more closely concerning their character and provenance. The method of approach, however, is the exact reverse of that pursued in the discussion of the Hexaplaric recension. There the analysis moved from Origen's known recensional principles to the identification of MSS exhibiting those principles. Here the analysis begins with a description of the characteristic readings of MSS 22 . . . 763 and only at the end considers the question of probable origin. The difference in approach is necessitated by the difference in the kind of historical and MS information--or lack of it--that is available for the two groups.³²

All MSS of this group are mediaeval cursives containing the writings of the prophetic books only, the earliest (407) from the ninth century, the latest (311) from the twelfth century. With the exception of two (51 449'), they all have this in common in Jer that they follow the Heb (and Hexaplaric) internal order and position of the Oracles Against the Nations. MSS 51 and 449' follow the normal Gk order and position of the oracles by placing them in the middle of the book, though 51 is a special case since it repeats these oracles in the Heb order at the end of the book (as indicated above, p.17 the second occurrence of these oracles is identified in my notes by the symbol 51^s). The united attestation of all MSS in this group to a particular reading will be subsumed under the symbol L.³³ The material will be marshalled under the following outline:

1. Readings Common to O and L
 - a. Readings Identical in O and L
 - b. Readings Slightly Different in O and L
2. Readings Common to the Younger Gk Versions and L
 - a. Readings Identical in the Younger Gk Versions and L
 - b. Readings Slightly Different in Younger Gk Versions and L

3. Readings Unique to L

a. Additions

- i. Of Articles
- ii. Of Conjunctions
- iii. Of Pronouns
- iv. Of Prepositional Phrase

b. Omissions

c. Word Substitutions

d. Form Substitutions

4. Readings of L Supported by Chrysostom and Theodoret

a. Readings Identical in O and L Supported by Chr/Tht

b. L Modifications of O Readings Supported by Chr/Tht

c. L Readings Derived from Younger Gk Versions Supported by Chr/Tht

d. Readings Unique to L Supported by Chr/Tht

5. Readings of L Supported by $Q^{mg}/86^{mg}/Syh^{mg}$

6. Subdivisions Within L

7. Significance of the Data

1. Readings Common to O and L

Below are catalogued those readings which are attested only in O and L. Usually these readings are found in identical form in both traditions, but sometimes they appear in a slightly modified or supplemented way in L. Most of the examples have been met with before, but there are also some new ones.

a. Readings Identical in O and L

29:4 τοὺς καταλοίπους 2^ο] pr. (add 62) τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους
 (+ καὶ 36) ·x· O L = α' θ' (·x· Q^{mg}), ο' (·x· 86^{mg})
 = MT

29:4 τῶν νήσων] καὶ καππαδοκίας O L (·x· 449')
 = α' θ' (·x· Q^{mg}), οὐ γ' (καππαδοκίας) 86^{mg} = MT

29:8 κύριος] + τῶν δυνάμεων O L ·x· Q^{mg} = ο' (86^{mg}) = MT

- 29:10 κατάλειμμα] καλαμηματα O L
= ο' (86^m)
- 29:10 ἤλθον] + σοι O L = σ' (86^m)
- 29:11 διὰ χεῖρα] pr. το (om. το O 51-62-311-407-449')
σπέρμα αυτού * O L * Q^m
= ο' (* 86^m)
- 29:13 ἔπιον] pr. πιοντες * O L = α' θ' (* Q^m),
οι γ' (* 86^m), οι λ' (S^{yh} πιονται) = MT
- 29:13 ἀθωωμένη] + αθωωθηση * O L^{-51 62 449}
= θ' (* 86^m) = MT
- 29:14 εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμόν] εἰς αφανισμόν και
εἰς ονειδισμόν και εἰς αβατον O L = MT;
cf. pr. ο' εἰς αφανισμόν (86^m)
- 29:17 καθελῶ σε] + φησιν) κυριος O L = ο' (86^m) = MT
- 29:20 καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστήσατε] και
τις εκλεκτος προς αυτην επισκεψομαι 88-S^{yh}^{tat}
= α', ο' (86^m) = MT; + και τις εκλεκτος προς
(επ 62) αυτην επισκεψομαι L (lectio duplex)
- 29:22 ἐν θαλάσῃ] + ερυθρά O L = οι γ', ο' (86^m) = MT

b. Readings Slightly Different in O and L

- 29:1 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους] pr. * os εγενηθη λογος
κυριου προς ιερειαν τον προφητην O (tr. os εγ./
λογ. κυ. S^{yh}); + os εγενετο λογος κυριου προς
ιερειαν τον προφητην (+ επι τους αλλοφυλους 51-62
-311-449') L

The change from the aor. pass. ἐγένεθην to the aor. mid. ἐγένετο is frequently found in the L group of MSS. The introduction of an aor. pass. form -εθην instead of the mid. -εμεν on deponent verbs was a feature of the Koine (cf. Thackeray, Grammar, pp. 238-239). According to Mayser (*I*², 2, p. 157), the passive forms were used increasingly in the third century B.C., reaching a height in the second century B.C. But the Atticists objected to this form and preferred the middle (cf. Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, p. 108, ὁ Ἀττικίζων γενέσθαι λεγέτω). The frequent preference in L for the middle is probably to be explained in terms of the atticising tendency.

29:13 ὁ θωυθῆς] + οτι πιουσα πισαι O ; + οτι
πινουσα πη L ; + οτι πινων (πιων Q 26 544;
πινοντι 534) πισαι A Q V 26 46 86 130 233 239
534 544 613 710

It will be argued below (p. 101) that the Hexaplaric form ὅτι πιουσα πῆσαι is a slight modification of a pre-Origenic addition ὅτι πινων πῆσαι. The L reading ὅτι πινουσα πῆ is a further modification of the Hexaplaric form, the change from the indicative future πῆσαι to the more stylistic subjunctive πῆ in the translation of the Heb infinitive absolute being especially noteworthy.

29:14 ἔση ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς] εση ἐν μέσῳ μερη αὐτης O;
εση βοσορ ἐν μέσῳ μερους αὐτης L

The phrase μερη αὐτῆς in O has been changed in L to μερους αὐτῆς in order to correct the lack of agreement of case in O. For discussion of the addition of βοσορ (=MT) in L see below p. 80.

29:14 εἰς αἰῶνα] εἰς τον αἰωνα A Q 49 87 90 91 233
410 490 538 613 764 ; εἰς αἰωνας O 51-445' ;
εως αἰωνος L^{-51 445'}

The expressions εἰς αἰῶνα and εἰς αἰῶνας are both anomalous since in biblical Gk the phrase is almost invariably found with the article (as in A Q . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). However, in the construction with ἕως the article is generally omitted. The L text has adopted this better Gk form.

29:22 ἡκούσθη] ἐξηκουσθη ἡ φωνὴ αὐτῆς O = MT;
ἐξηκουσθη ἡ (om. ἡ L^{51 62 III 407 449'}) φωνή
σου L

The reading of the majority of Gk MSS prior to the addition in O and L of the phrase (ἡ) φωνὴ αὐτῆς is καὶ κραυγὴ σου ἐν θαλάσῃ ἡκούσθη. The addition of the phrase found in O ἡ φωνὴ αὐτῆς (=MT) makes no sense at all in the Gk. However, by changing the pronoun αὐτῆς to σου, L has effectively put the phrase φωνὴ σου in apposition to the previous phrase κραυγὴ σου, thus restoring some logic to the Gk sentence.

29:23 ὄψεται] + * καὶ ἐπιπτήσεται O; ἀναβήσεται
καὶ ἐπιστήσεται (ἐπιπτήσεται 51-51'-62-407-449') L;
cf. MT הַאֲדָמָה יִבָּלֵעַ.

As noted above (p. 68), the LXX translation ὄψεται was occasioned by a misreading of τ for γ in MT הַאֲדָמָה. Origen's addition of καὶ ἐπιπτήσεται (originally Symmachus' rendition of הַאֲדָמָה) left הַאֲדָמָה without Gk equivalent (a lack supplied in L by taking ἀναβήσεται from α' σ'). Some MSS of the L group, reflecting Hexaplaric influence (see below, p. 89), retain ἐπιπτήσεται, while others have altered ἐπιπτήσεται to ἐπιστήσεται, perhaps as a more suitable Gk parallel for ἀναβήσεται (even though further removed from the Heb).³⁴

It can be seen from the above six examples that modifications of O readings in L often go against the Heb but always in favour of better Gk grammar and logic. Conformity to the Heb was obviously

no guiding principle in the formation of the L text.

2. Readings Common to the Younger Gk Versions and L

Sometimes L has gone even further than O in adopting readings from the younger Gk versions. Some of these are reproduced identically in L, some are slightly altered.

a. Readings Identical in the Younger Gk Versions and L

29:2 ἀλαλάξουσιν] ολολυξουσιν (-λυζ. 22* -48*)
L = α' (86^m)

29:3 ὅπλων τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ] ὀπλων αὐτου των δυνατων
L = Θ' (86^m; Q^m δυνατω for δυνατων) ≠ MT

29:6 ἕως τίνος κόψεις] pr. εως ποτε συστραφῆσθε
L S⁴h^m = σ' (86^m)

29:12 ὀρφανόν] ὀρφανους L = α' (S⁴h^m), σ' ιω' (86^m),
σ' (Ghisler II, p. 861) = MT

29:17 καρδιάς] pr. της L = α' σ' (86^m)

29:23 ὥψεται] αναβησεται L = α' σ' (86^m, S⁴h^m) = MT

b. Readings Slightly Different in the Younger Gk Versions and L

29:6 ἐπάρθητι] ησυχασον (-σαι 62) L = MT;
cf. α' σιωπησον (86^m)

L has either replaced Aquila's translation with a synonym, or else has borrowed a reading from Symmachus not preserved for us. The latter alternative is quite possible since L has already employed a phrase from Symmachus in v. 6 (ἕως πότε συστραφῆσθε).

ἡσυχάζω is the common LXX translation of שָׁרָא, the Heb word used here.

29:12 ὑπολείπεται] pr. ο λέγων L; cf. σ' pr. ος ερει 86^m

Symmachus perhaps read גַּלְגַּלִּי instead of MT וַיִּגְלַל and thus translated ὅς ἐρει. This has been modified in L to ὁ λέγων. In both cases the new phrase has the effect of making v. 12 a direct quote contrary to MT.

29:12 ἵνα ζήσῃται καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι] ἵνα σωθῶσι(ν) καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτοὺς διασωσω L Syh^m; cf. ἰω' ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτοὺς διασωσω 86^m; σ' ἐγὼ διασωσω 86^m

The phrase ἵνα ζήσῃται καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι is a double reading for MT הִנֵּה יָגֵל (see below, p. 102). L has taken over, with a slight alteration, the translation of יו'.³⁵ With the addition of αὐτούς, the new translation makes explicit what is probably implicit in the Heb הִנֵּה, which also results in more coherent Gk.

29:14 ἔση ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς] εση βοσορ εν μεσω μέρους αὐτῆς L; cf. οἱ γ' εσται βοσορα 86^m Syh^m (sub οἱ λ')

The phrase ἐν μέσῳ/μέρους constitutes a double reading in O and L for MT הִנֵּה (see above, p. 71). The addition of βοσορ (=MT) in L constitutes a triple reading in that group. The spelling has been slightly altered (Hellenised) from The Three.

29:21 συμψησθῶσι] + αὐτῶν L 86^m; cf. σ' συμψησωσιν αὐτοὺς 86^m; + * αὐτῶ Q^m

The addition of the pronoun is in conformity with the Heb plural suffix, וְ .

The heavy reliance of L upon the younger Gk versions is quite evident in the above examples. Any approximation to the Heb in the new variants comes merely as a by-product of the use made of these versions rather than as a result of independent scrutiny on the part of L. Not infrequently L chooses a reading that moves away from MT. The conclusion reached in the previous sub-section, viz, that the Heb text was not a determining factor in the L revision, is confirmed again. By contrast, a smoother and more coherent Gk style definitely was an important factor in the choice of new readings.

3. Readings Unique to L

In addition to the readings in L which are modifications of O or the younger Gk versions, this group (or members of it) also attests several other readings entirely without support elsewhere in the Gk MS collection.

a. Additions

i. Of Articles

29:5 Ενα κείμ] pr. των L

29:11 διὰ χείρα] pr. (✱ O - Q^m) σπέρμα (το
σπέρμα Q^m L^{-51 62 311 407 449'}) αυτού O L Q^m

29:15 κυρίου] pr. του L^{-51 449'}

29:21 βουλήν] pr. την L

29:23 ἐπ' ὀχυρώματα] επι τα οχ. L

ii. Of Conjunctions

29:3 ἀπό 2°] pr. και L ≠ MT

29:17 ἰταμία] και η ατιμία L^{-51 62 407 449'} ≠ MT

29:20 ἐκδιώξω] και διώξω L^{-51 62 407 449'} ≠ MT

iii. Of Pronouns

29:10 ἐπίθῃσουσι] + σοι L Q^{mg} ≠ MT

29:12 χῆραι] αι χηραι (χειρες 62-407) σου = MT

iv. Of Prepositional Phrase

29:15 ἀνάστητε εἰς πόλεμον] + επ αυτην L S^h ^{mg} ≠ MT

b. Omission

29:8 ὥχετο σοφία αὐτῶν] om. L^{-51 407 449'} (hap.)

c. Word Substitutions

29:8 βουλή] συμβουλη L^{-51 62 311 407 449'}

29:15 εἰς αὐτήν] επ αυτην L^{-62 407} S^h ^{mg} = MT;
εν αυτη 62; om. 407 (hap.)

ἰταμία] η ατιμία L^{-51 62 407 449'} ≠ MT

ὅτι ταχὺ ἐκδιώξω] οτι ταχυς και διωξω
L^{-51 62 407 449'}

d. Form Substitutions

29:12 πεποιθήσιν } πεποιθέντων 51-51^s-62-407-449'

29:17 συνέλαβεν } -βον 22*-48-407-763 ≠ MT

29:18 ἐπ' αὐτήν } ἐπ' αὐτή 51-311-407-445'

The above examples confirm again the conclusions of the previous two sections, namely that readings unique to L bear no consistent relationship to the Heb. In fact, where judgements can be made, they appear to go against MT more frequently than they approximate MT. On the other hand, the same readings do manifest a definite interest in the improvement of Gk style and sense. A good example of the latter is v. 17 ἰταμία καρδίας } καὶ ἡ αἰμία τῆς καρδίας. In this case, the interchange of one letter, α for ι, provides the phrase with a familiar and meaningful word in the context instead of a rare word, unattested outside Jer and of uncertain meaning. The change in 29:20 from ὅτι ταχὺ ἐκδιώξω to ὅτι ταχύς· καὶ διώξω may also have been motivated by a desire to improve on the sense of the Gk, reading, "for (he is) swift, and I will chase them from her", instead of, "for I will quickly drive them from her". However, the change could also be explained as a scribal correction of a faulty uncial MS.³⁶

4. Readings of L Supported by Chrysostom and Theodoret

The L Group readings are most frequently supported by the Antiochean Fathers Chrysostom (d. 407) and Theodoret (d. 466). This may be clearly seen from the following examples.

a. Readings Identical in O and L Supported by Chr/Tht

29:4 τοὺς καταλοίπους } pr: (αλλ. 62; ✕ O) τοὺς
 αλλοφυλοὺς O L Chr Tht

- 29:4 τῶν νήσων] + και κατπαδοκίας O L Chr Tht
- 29:5 οἱ κατάλοιποι] τα λοιπα O L 86^{ms} Chr Tht
- 29:11 ὤλοντο] ὠλετο O L Q^c 86^{ms} 106 130 Tht
- 29:11 διὰ χεῖρα] pr. (⋆ O Q^{ms}) (το) σπερμν αυτου O L Q^{ms} Tht
- 29:13 ἔπιον] pr. (⋆ O) πιοντες O L Tht
- 29:14 εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμόν] εἰς αφανισμόν και
εἰς ονειδισμόν και εἰς αβατον O L Tht
- 29:17 σοι] + ταυτα 88 (sub ⋆) L Syh^{ms} Tht
- 29:17 τρυμαλιάς] εν τρυμαλιαῖς 88 L^{-51 449'} Syh^{ms} Tht
- 29:17 καθελῶ σε] φησι(ν) κυριος O L Tht (λεγει κ.)
- 29:20 ὥσπερ 1^o] ως O L Chr

Although most of the above readings are of Hexaplaric origin (except for the addition of ταῦτα and the variant ἐν τρυμαλιαῖς in v. 17 which are most probably of L origin), they are at the same time an integral part of the L text.

b. L Modifications of O Readings Supported by Chr/Tht

- 29:13 ἀθῶω θῆς] + οτι πιουσα πιεσαι O ; οτι
πινουσα πτη L Tht
- 29:14 ἔση ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς] εση εν μεσω μερη αυτης O ;
εση βοσορ εν μεσω μερους αυτης L Chr Tht
- 29:14 εἰς αἰῶνα] εἰς αιωνας O 51-449' ; εως αιωνος
L^{-51 449'} Tht (εως του αιωνος)

These readings are of special significance since they show that when O and L part company, Chr/Tht go with L.

c. L Readings Derived from the Younger Gk Versions Supported by Chr/Tht

- 29:6 ἕως] pr. εως ποτε συστραφησεσθε L S^h Tht = σ' 86^m
- 29:6 ἐπάρθητι] ησυχασον (σαι 62) L Tht^p
- 29:12 ὑπολείπεσθαι] pr. ο λεγων L Tht (ο ελεων Tht^p)
- 29:12 ὀρφανόν] -νους L Tht
- 29:12 ἵνα ζήσῃται καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι] ινα σωθωσι(ν)
καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτοὺς διασωσω L S^h Tht
- 29:17 καρδίας] pr. της L Tht

d. Readings Unique to L Supported by Chr/Tht

- 29:5 Ἐνακείμ] pr. των L Chr Tht
- 29:8 om. ὥχετο σοφία αὐτῶν L^{-51 407 449} Tht (vid.)
- 29:10 ἐπιθήσουσιν] + σοι L Q^m Tht^p
- 29:12 χῆραι] αὶ χηραι (χειρες 62-407) σου L Tht
- 29:12 πεποιθήσιν] πεποιθετωσαν 51-51^s-62-407-449^s Tht
- 29:15 εἰς αὐτήν] επ αυτην L^{-62 407} S^h Tht
- 29:15 πόλεμον] + επ αυτην L S^h Tht
- 29:17 ἰταμία] καὶ (om. καὶ 311) ἡ ατιμία L^{-51 62 407 449^s} Tht

29:17 συναλαβεν] - βον 22* - 48 - 407 - 763 Tht^P

29:21 βουλήν] pr. την L Tht

The significance of the striking agreement between L and Chr/Tht is discussed below, p. 90. 37

5. Readings of L Supported by Q^{mg}/86^{mg}/Syh^{mg}

In addition to the clearly identified readings of the younger Gk translators such as Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the margins of Q, 86, and Syh further contain a number of anonymous readings. Since many of these agree with the L group it suggests that the margins of these MSS constitute another source of witness to the text of this group. Sometimes these anonymous marginal readings support a variant attested in both the Q and L groups, in which case it is difficult to determine which was the original source; but the number of unique L readings supported by these margins, especially that of Syh, indicate that the L text was by no means the less important source.

a. Readings of L Supported by Q^{mg}

29:10 ἐπιθήσουσι] + σοι L Q^{mg} ≠ MT

29:11 διὰ χεῖρα] pr. (·x̄ Q^{mg}) σπέρμα (το σπέρμα
L^{-51 62 311 407 449} Q^{mg}) αὐτοῦ O L Q^{mg}

b. Readings of L Supported by 86^{mg}

29:5 οἱ κατάλοιποι] τα λοιπα 88 (- Syh) L 86^{mg}

29:21 συμφησθῶσιν] + αὐτῶν L 86^{mg} (cf. + ·x̄ αὐτῶν Q^{mg})

c. Readings of L Supported by Syh^{mg}

- 29:6 ἕως τίνος κόψεις } πρ. εως ποτε συστραφησεςθε
L Syh^{ms}
- 29:12 ἵνα ζήσῃται καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι } ινα σωθῶσιν και
εγω αυτους διασωσω L Syh^{ms}
- 29:15 εἰς αὐτήν } επ αυτην L^{-62 407} Syh^{ms} ; εν αυτη 62 ; om. 407
- 29:15 πόλεμον } + επ αυτην L Syh^{ms}
- 29:17 σοι } + ταυτα * 88 L Syh^{ms}
- 29:17 τρυμαλίας } εν τρυμαλiais 88 L^{-51 449'} Syh^{ms}
- 29:22 ἠκούσθη } εξηκουσθη η φωνη αυτης O ;
εξηκουσθη η φωνη σου L Syh^{ms}

6. Subdivisions Within L

Our documentation of the L group in Jer 29 has revealed several occasions where a few MSS have defaulted from supporting the reading of the group. Among these defaulters 51-449' form a special pair.

- 29:3 ὅπλων τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ } + των δυνατων 51-449' ;
οπλων αυτου των δυνατων L^{-51 449'} ; οπλων των
δυνατων αυτου O
- 29:14 εἰς αἰῶνα } εις αιωνας O 51-449' ;
εως αιωνος L^{-51 449'}
- 29:15 κυρίου } πρ. του L^{-51 449'}
- 29:17 παιγνία } + της καρδιας 51-449

29:17 τρυμαλιώς] εν τρυμαλιαίς 88 L^{-51 449'} S₄h^m

This pair differs from the rest of the L group in another important way, in that they follow the usual position and internal order of the Oracles Against the Nations in the middle of the book (though as already pointed out, 51 is unique in that it repeats the OAN section in the Heb internal order and position at the end of the book, labeled 51^S in this investigation). These MSS often show strong Hexaplaric influence.

Frequently 51-449' are joined by a few other members of the larger group, especially 62, 407, and sometimes 311.

29:1 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους] + ος ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου προς ἱερειῶν τον προφητην (+ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλ. 51-62-311-449') προ του παταξαι ρακω την γαζαν L

29:8 βουλή] συμβουλή L^{-51 62 311 407 449'}

29:8 ὥχετο σοφία αὐτῶν] om. L^{-51 407 449'}

29:8 σοφία] pr. η 51-407-449' 239

29:9 βαθύνατε] + εαυτοῖς 36-51-449' et al.

29:11 ὥλοντο] ὤλετο σπέρμα (το σπ. L^{-51 62 311 407 449'}) αὐτου O L

29:12 πεποίθασιν] πεποιθετώσαν 51-51^S-62-407-449'

29:13 ἀθωωμένη] + αθωωθησῃ O L^{-51 62 449'}

29:17 ἰταμία] και (om. και 311) η ατιμία L^{-51 62 407 449'}

29:18 ἐπ' αὐτήν] επ αυτη 51-311-407-449'

- 29:20 ταχὺ ἐκδιώξω } ταχὺς καὶ διώξω L^{-51 62 407 449'}
- 29:21 συμψησθῶσι } συνψηφισθῶσι 51-62 (συμψι.)
-311-407-449' et al.
- 29:23 ἡκούσθη } ἐξηκούσθη φωνή (pr. η 51-62-311
-407-449 = 0) σου L
- 29:23 ὄψεται } ἀναβησεται καὶ ἐπιστησεται (ἐπιπτησεται
51-51'-62-407-449' = 0) L

The above readings show that when 51-62-(311)-407-449' depart from the L group they join either the common LXX reading (e.g. 29:8 βουλή) or the corresponding 0 reading (e.g. 29:14 εἰς αἰῶνας 0 51-449'; 29:11 om. το 0 51-62-311-407-449'; 29:23 ἡ φωνή 0 51-62-311-407-449'). On a few occasions they attest a new reading altogether (e.g. 29:17 τῆς καρδίας 51-449'; 29:18 ἐπ' αὐτῇ 51-311-407-449). Such facts suggest that these L MSS have undergone a late revision in favour of the common LXX text and the Hexaplaric recension. With regard to 51 and 51^S it is interesting to note that it is regularly 51 that departs from the main group whereas 51^S stays with it.

7. Significance of the Data

It is clear on the basis of the foregoing analysis that the special readings associated with the L text are not of the type that "just happen" in MS transmission. Rather they are of the type that must have originated in a deliberate re-working of the Gk text. Underlying this work of revision can be discerned certain guiding principles. One of these was to revise in favour of a more acceptable and coherent Gk; another was a preference for certain atticistic versus hellenistic forms; yet a third principle, judging by the several double readings present³⁸ and the almost total lack of any omissions,³⁹ was to preserve and combine as much as possible of the existent textual heritage.

As to method, the evidence shows that the text was created out of a variety of sources, including the Hexaplaric recension, the younger Gk versions, and independent alterations. Conspicuous by its absence in this list of sources is the Heb text, which seems to have played no role at all in the work of revision. What we have, therefore, is a situation the exact reverse of the hexaplaric recension. There the concern was to produce a text approximating the Heb as closely as possible (at least quantitatively) without much regard to Gk syntax or coherence, and to eliminate (or at least call attention to) all that was not in agreement with the Heb. Here the concern is for Gk readability with no eye to the Heb and with as much as possible of the textual tradition included. But even though the principles of revision are drastically different, it is obvious that there is as much deliberate intervention in the formation of the one text as in the other. For this reason we are amply justified and even compelled to call the L group a "recension".

But where did this recension originate? Helpful clues in localizing a text are often obtained through a comparison with citations of the Church Fathers. When this criterion is applied to Jer it is found--as we have seen above--that the Antiochean Fathers Chrysostom and Theodoret quote from a text almost identical to L. This in turn means that the L recension must have circulated in those areas where Chrysostom and Theodoret lived, i.e., in and around Antioch and Constantinople.

This in turn has implications for views regarding the authorship of the L recension. In the absence of explicit information in the L MSS themselves, conclusions on this subject have to be inferential and tentative, but a key witness in the case is obviously Jerome who, in his famous reference to the trifaria varietas of texts which flourished in the Eastern Mediterranean Church of his day, affirms that the rendering which held the field in the area from Constantinople to Antioch was that of "Lucian the martyr".⁴⁰ This Lucian, otherwise known as Lucian of Antioch or Lucian of Samosata (his birthplace), was a presbyter and leading

exponent of the Antiochean exegetical school, martyred under Maximin in 311/312. Since the late nineteenth century, Jerome's statement has formed the cornerstone of Lucian Forschung,⁴¹ but recently the traditional connection between Lucian and the text associated with his name has been put in question. In a vigorous challenge, D. Barthélemy has denied that the "Lucianic recension" is either a recension or Lucianic.⁴² To settle the controversy lies beyond the scope of this study, though it does seem that Barthélemy is unnecessarily sceptical of the historical tradition surrounding Lucian (he prefers to call it a myth). In the absence of any definitive evidence to the contrary, therefore, we may continue to speak of the L text as "Lucianic" and at least for Jer we must insist on it being called a "recension".

But whether the text be called "Lucianic", "Antiochian" (G.F. Moore), "Syrian" (M.L. Margolis) or anything else, what is of real importance to the text critic is the realization that the special readings transmitted by this text are the result of a revision generally introduced from late sources.⁴³ Such readings are therefore secondary and can have no place in a restored LXX archetype.

C. The C Group (or Catena Text)

There is a third group among the MSS of Jer which closely hangs together and stems from a common source. These are the Catena MSS 49 87 90 91 490 764,⁴⁴ so called because of the "chains" of patristic commentaries strung together in their margins. This type of literature arose in the Byzantine church in the declining phase of the patristic period (sixth to ninth centuries), when scholarly activity in the church was expended in the preservation of the old rather than in the creation of new theological learning. Although this preservation of the writings of many of the Fathers was of invaluable service to future generations, our present concern is not with the catena commentaries themselves, but with the biblical text around which the commentaries were placed.

Of the six Catena MSS collated for Jer, four (49 87 90 91) are of the type that Faulhaber has called "Rahmen catene", where the patristic passages form a crowded but neat frame around the continuous biblical text.⁴⁵ The other two MSS (490 764) contain the same type of biblical text, but with the patristic passages omitted from the margins. Apart from 764, these MSS all come from the tenth or eleventh centuries; 764 is later and hails from the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries.

The Catena text draws its readings from various sources. This can be seen by the way it shares readings with diverse textual traditions and by the relative lack of any new readings of its own. The symbol employed for this group is quite naturally C, and the material will be surveyed under the following headings:

1. Readings in Common with O/L
2. Readings in Common with Various Minuscules
3. Readings in Common with Various Uncials
 - a. In Common with A
 - b. In Common with B-S
 - c. In Common with Q-V
 - d. In Common with Different Combinations of Uncials
4. Subdivisions Within C
5. Significance of the Data

1. Readings in Common with O/L

29:7 ἐπὶ 2°] πρ. και Syh L C 46 410 534 613 ≠ MT

29:9 ἡ πατήθη] επατηθη Syh C^{-49 90 764} ≠ MT

29:19 κατοικήσει] -ση O L C 46 86 106 410 534 544

29:20 Ἀ.Θάμ] αἰμαθ 36^c 613 O C ≠ MT

2. Readings in Common with Various Minuscules

29:6 ἀνάπαυσαι] πρ. και C 613 ≠ MT

29:8 τῇ ἰδουμαίᾳ } ἰουδαία C^{-87 91 490} 534 ≠ MT

29:11 αὐτοῦ 2° } om. C 106 ≠ MT

29:15 ἀπέστειλεν } ἐξ απ. C^{-87 91 490} 534 613

29:17 ὕψωσεν } -σας C 106 = MT

29:22 κραυγῇ } pr. η C 106 239 410 613 ≠ MT

3. Readings in Common with Various Uncials

a. In Common with A

29:4 τοὺς 2° } τας A C 86 410

29:10 ὡς } ὡσπερ A C 106 613

29:12 χῆραι } pr. αἱ A C 106 233 239 410 613 ≠ MT

29:13 ἀθῶσθῆς } + ὅτι πίνων πιεσαι A C 46 86 130 233 239 613 = MT

29:16 εὐκαταφρόνητον } pr. καὶ A C O 239 410 613 ≠ MT

b. In Common with B-S

29:10 ᾗ λθον B-S C Q^c 106 410 538 613 } + σοι rel. = MT

29:10 οἱ B-S C Q^c O L 26 106 233 239 410 538 613 }
om. rel. = MT

29:10 κατάλειμμα B-S C 26 106 239 410 534 613 }
καταλείμματα A Q-V 46 86 130 233 538 544 710;
καλαμηματα O L

29:16 μικρόν B-S C 26 46 106 410 538 } pr. ἰδου
A Q-V 86 130 233 239 534 544 613 710 O L⁻⁶² = MT

c. In Common with Q-V

29:18 συριεῖ] εκστησεται (pr. συριει C) και συριει επι
 παση τη πληγη (πασαν την πληγην Q-239-613) αυτης
 Q-V C O L 26 46 86 233 239 534 544 613 710 = MT

29:21 αὐτούς Q-V C 46 86 233 239 534 544 613 710 = MT]
 αυτην B-S* 106 130 410 538; αυτης S^c 26; αυτη A

d. In Common with Different Combinations of Uncials

29:9 βαθύνετε] + εαυτοις A Q C

29:9 ἐπ' 2° B Q S C] om. A V

29:10 χεῖρα] -ας A Q S C

29:12 καὶ ἐγὼ ῥήσθαι A B S C] om. Q-V

29:13 οἷς A B S C] pr. ιδου Q-V

29:14 κατάρασιν] καταραν A S V C

29:14 αἰῶνα] pr. τον A Q C

29:22 ὅτι A B S C] om. Q-V

29:22 καί A B S C] om. Q-V

29:22 ἐν θαλάσῃ A Q V C] θαλασσης ουκ B-S

On all occasions except one (29:9 ἐπ') C goes with the combination of uncials in which A is to be found, which suggests that the Catena text has a slight tendency to favour the A text (cf. Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 96).

4. Subdivisions Within C

Although on the whole the Catena MSS form a very close-knit group, on occasion they subdivide into two groups: 87-91-490 and 49-90-764.

- 29:2 ἄπαντες 87-91-490 } παντες 49-90-764
- 29:5 Ἐνακείμ 49-90-764 } ενακίμ 87-91-490
- 29:8 Ἰδουμαία 87-91-490 } ιουδαία 49-90-764
- 29:9 ἡπατήθη 49-90-764 } επατηθη 87-91-490
- 29:15 ἀπέστειλε 87-91-490 } ἐξαπέστειλε(ν) 49-90-764

MSS 91-490 are especially closely linked:

- 29:9 αὐτόν 2° } αὐτῷ 91-490
- 29:10 καταλείψουσι(ν) } καταλιψ. 91-490 et al.
- 29:10 κατάλειμμα } -λιμμα 91-490 (-764) et al.
- 29:13 ἀθωωθῆς } αθωωθης 91-490 et al.
- 29:14 εἰς 2° } om. 91-490 et al.

Certain features such as the preference for -ι- as opposed to -ει- forms in (87)-91-490 suggests that this is the earlier or the "Hauptgruppe".

5. Significance of the Data

The general cohesion of the Catena MSS is an established fact, but how are we to describe the nature of the text and how has it come about? It certainly does not appear to be a recension

in the sense that the Hexaplaric and Lucianic groups are recensions. It is practically impossible to discern in its readings any consistent editorial policy. Certainly approximation to the Heb was no factor in the formation of the text; in fact, most of its readings go contrary to the Heb. A slight tendency toward more standard Gk is discernible, but not nearly on the scale as in the Lucianic recension.

At the same time, it is equally clear that the text presupposes some form of editorial intervention. Since in our chapter all of its readings are found in at least some other MS or MSS, it seems likely that the text was constructed as a synthesis of existing textual traditions. As such it is the "mixed text" par excellence.

Although it no doubt served the needs of the time and may even have become a type of textus receptus in the Mediaeval church, its shifting loyalties make it almost impossible to classify and give it only minimal value in our search for the earliest recoverable Gk text of Jer.

D. The Q Group

Turning from the Hexaplaric, Lucianic, and Catena groups, the next three sections will be organized around the five uncial codices which contain the text of Jer. These divide into three groups: Q-V, A, and B-S. Around each group cluster in turn a number of more or less faithful minuscules.

By the term "Q group" is meant that group of MSS of which it can be said that the sixth century Codex Marchalianus (Q) stands as the chief representative, even though that codex itself may not always support the reading of the group. In the previous sections we have already noted several readings from the margin of Q; here we examine the text proper of Q. Frequently allied with Q is the eighth century Codex Venedig (V), hence the designation Q-V. On a number of occasions Codex Alexandrinus (A), with or without its congeners 106-410, joins Q-V against the

remaining two uncials, but other considerations (see next section) go to show that it does not properly belong to the Q group. Of the minuscules, the following associate themselves more or less regularly with Q: 26 46 86 233 534 544 613 710 (since 86 and 710 are almost identical, henceforth 86' = 86-710). MSS 130 239 and 538 also sometimes join the group. The foregoing MSS range in date from as early as the ninth to tenth century (86), to as late as the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. The following outline will apply:

1. Readings of Q-V+
2. Readings of Q-V+ A
3. Readings of V+
4. Significance of the Data

1. Readings of Q-V+⁴⁶

29:10 ὡς] ὡς περ A 106 410 613 ; ὡς εἰ Q-V-26-46-86'
-130-233-239-534-538-544 O L

29:12 καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι] om. Q-V-26-46-86'-130-233-534
-544 O

29:13 οἷς] pr. ἰδου Q-V-26-46-86'-130-233-239-534
-544-613 O L = MT

29:18 συριεῖ] ἐκστῆσεται καὶ συριεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τῇ πληγῇ
(πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν Q-239-613) αὐτῆς Q-V-26-46
-86'-233-239-534-544-613 O L = MT

29:21 ἐπ' αὐτοῦς Q-V-46-86'-233-239-534-544-613 O L = MT]
ἐπ' αὐτήν B-S* ; ἐπ' αὐτήν A

29:22 ὅτι] om. Q-V-26-46-86'-233-534-544 O L = MT

29:22 καὶ] om. Q-V-26-46-86'-130-233-534-544 O L = MT

The above examples demonstrate the considerable cohesion that exists among the members of the group Q-V-26-46-86-(130)-233-(239)-534-544-(613)-710. It is clear that they must reflect some common background. Also of significance is the fact that each of the above readings is supported by O/L (L is missing once) and, where a judgment can be made, each constitutes an approximation to MT. The implications of this will be discussed below in sub-division 4.

2. Readings of Q-V+ A

29:3 ἐφ'] ἐπὶ A 106 410 Q-V-26-46-86'-233-239-534
-544-538-613 O L

29:9 ἐπ' αὐτόν 2°] om. ἐπ A V-86'-239-534-538-544
O L⁻³⁶ = MT

29:10 ἡλθον] + σοὶ A Q-V-26-46-86'-130-233-239-534
-544 O L = MT

29:10 οἱ] om. A Q-V-46-86'-130-534-544 Syh = MT

29:10 κατάλειμμα] καταλείμματα A Q-V-46-86'-130
-233-538-544; καλεῖμματα O L

29:11 γείτονος] πρ. καὶ A 106 410 Q-V-26-46-86'-233
-239-534-538-613 O L = MT

29:11 γείτονό μου] γ. αὐτοῦ A 106 Q-V-26-46-86'
-233-239-534-538-613 O L = MT

29:13 λέγει A 106 410 Q-V-26-46-86'-130-233-239
-534-544-613 O L] εἶπεν B-S 538

29:13 ἀθωωθῆς] + ὅτι πινῶν (πινῶν Q-26-544; πινούσι 534;
πινούσα O) πινεῖν A Q-V-26-46-86'-233-239-534
-544-613 O = MT ; + ὅτι πινούσα πινῇ L = MT

- 29:16 μικρόν] pr. ιδου A Q-V-86'-130-233-239-534-544
-613 L^{u2}; pr. οτι (οτι sub .X. Syh) ιδου O 62 = MT
- 29:17 ὕψωσεν] εαν υψωσης (-σεις A 26 239 86^m) A 106
Q-V-26-46-86'-130-233-239-534-544-613 O L
- 29:22 ἰφοβήθη] εσ(ε)ισθη A 106 410 Q-V-26-46-86'-130
-233-239-534-544-613 O L = MT
- 29:22 κρυγή σου ἐν θαλάσση A 106 410 Q-V-26-46
-86'-130-233-239-534-538-544-613 O L] κρυγή
θαλάσσης ουκ B-S

As can be observed from the above examples, when A joins Q-V the same general pattern of O/L support and approximation to MT prevails.

3. Readings of V+

Twice in our chapter a similar pattern holds even where V is the sole uncial in the group.

- 29:19 ὥσπερ] ως V-26-46-86'-233-534-544 O L
- 29:22 ἠκούσθη] ἐξηκουσθη V-26-46-544 O L

4. Significance of the Data

The readings of the Q group of MSS (often joined by A) highlighted above have revealed a fairly consistent pattern of approximation to MT, together with regular support from the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions. Considering what is already known about the proclivity of the O (L) tradition to approximate the Heb, one might be tempted at first sight to attribute most of the above readings to the influence on Q of that tradition. But this theory, plausible as it seems, does not stand up to scrutiny.

It is remarkable, first of all, that even though the readings in this section are generally supported by O/L, none of these is a confirmed Hexaplaric reading, i.e., none enjoys such typical Hexaplaric support as an Origenic sign or Q^{mg} or 86^{mg} reading under the symbol of one of the younger Gk translators. Conversely, the confirmed Hexaplaric readings (see section A) are nowhere supported by the Q group. Therefore, if we wish to say that the above readings originated with the Hexaplaric/Lucianic recensions and were adopted from there by the Q text, then we must admit that the creators of the latter text proceeded in a strange way indeed. For in the process of adopting the alleged "Hexaplaric" readings listed above for which we have found no external Hexaplaric support, they just as studiously avoided adopting all readings which elsewhere we have found to possess such external support (section A). But this would be a bizarre procedure indeed, and it is quite absurd to think that anything like it should ever have happened, especially considering the high esteem in which the Hexaplaric text was held in the early centuries.

It is plain, therefore, that we must look for another explanation. The most likely is that the readings jointly attested by the Q text and O/L stem from a common source, and this common source must have been a pre-Hexaplaric revision of the Gk text towards the Heb.⁴⁷ The MS(S) embodying this revision were known to Origen and used by him. In fact, the evidence suggests that the proto-Q text became Origen's Gk Vorlage, probably chosen deliberately because it most closely approximated the Heb. This explains why the readings common to the Q text and O/L recensions are nowhere marked with Hexaplaric signs: they were adopted by Origen from existent MSS and were not introduced by him. A pair of examples will help to clarify the difference in attestation between a typical Q reading and a genuine Hexaplaric reading:

29:4 τοὺς καταλοίπους 2°] pr. (x̄·O) τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους
 O L = 'α' θ' in Q^{mg} , O' in 86^{mg} = HT

29:8 κύριος] + (x̄· Q^{mg}) τῶν δυνάμεων O L Q^{mg}
 = O' in 86^{mg} = HT

- 29:13 ἄθωωθῆς] + ὅτι πίνων (πίνων Q-26-544 ;
 πινοντι 534) πίεσαι A Q-V-26-46-86'-233-239-534
 -544-613 = MT ; + ὅτι πίνουσα πίεσαι O = MT ;
 + ὅτι πίνουσα πίνη L = MT
- 29:18 συριεῖ] ἐκσῆσται καὶ συριεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τῇ
 πληγῇ (πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν Q-239-613) αὐτῆς Q-V
 -26-46-86'-233-239-534-544-613 O L = MT

In the first two examples both additions enjoy unequivocal Hexaplaric support. Both are asterised and both constitute approximations to MT. Their Hexaplaric origin is beyond question. They were taken over verbatim in the Lucianic recension.

In the second pair of readings neither addition is asterised nor supported by a Hexaplaric symbol; instead, each reading is supported by O/L and the Q group. The difference in attestation is to be explained as follows; the second pair of readings already existed at the time of Origen's revision and was simply incorporated by him unmarked in his LXX column, whereas the first pair of readings was not in existence at the time of Origen's work and were introduced by him.

In the reading from v. 13 we can see how an original Q reading has been taken over, but in slightly modified forms, by the O and L recensions. The pre-Hexaplaric addition probably read ὅτι πίνων πίεσαι (with scribal variants of πίνων and πινοντι in some MSS). Origen, however, changed the masc. part. πίνων to the fem. πίνουσα in conformity with the preceding participle ἄθωωμένη. Later still, the Lucianic text changed Origen's fem. 2nd aor. part. to the fem. pres. part. πίνουσα and altered the ind. πίεσαι to the subj. πίνη.

Other modifications seem to have taken place in the following two examples:

- 29:10 κατὰ λείμμα] κατὰ λ(ε)ίμματα A Q-V-46-86'
 -130-233-538-544 ; καλαμγματα O L

29:16 μικρόν] pr. ιδου A Q-V-86'-130-233-239-534
-544-613 L⁶²; pr. οτι (οτι sub X: 54) ιδου O 62 = MT

It is strange that in the second example the L text does not support O in the addition of ὅτι (except for 62 which does have it). This failure to support O may be due to ὅτι being a post-Hexaplaric approximation to the Heb and hence not present in L's Hexaplaric Vorlage, or else to the reluctance of L to transcribe such unidiomatic Gk as ὅτι ἰδού.

In 29:12 we have the interesting case where the Q text (followed by O) has eliminated a double reading in the old LXX (see discussion below Ch. 3, p. 158).

29:12 ἵνα ζήσῃται καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι] om. καὶ ἐγὼ
ζήσομαι Q-V-26-46-86'-130-233-534-544 O

The evidence of this section also helps us to formulate a rule for determining whether approximations to MT unsupported by either critical signs or Hexaplaric symbols derive from Origen or not. There are two criteria: internal character and external attestation. If an unmarked reading is to be deemed Hexaplaric its internal character must first be such as to harmonize with Origen's known text critical principles. Secondly, it must be attested only within the limits of O/L (possibly in company with a few straying minuscules), but not by O/L plus the Q group. If the reading is attested unmarked by O/L and the Q text, it probably derives from the pre-Hexaplaric revision.⁴⁸ Again, two examples will explain the rule:

29:14 εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν] tr. αβατον /
ονειδισμον O L = MT

29:22 ἡκούσθη] εἰς ηκουσθη η φωνη αυτης (σου L ≠ MT) O L = MT

The two variant readings above constitute correct approximations to MT. However, they are nowhere supported by external

Hexaplaric signs or symbols. Yet they must derive from Origen because they are attested only within the limits of O/L. Had they also been attested by the Q text they would undoubtedly have derived from that pre-Hexaplaric revision.

If we now wish to inquire more closely into the origins of the Q text, there is unfortunately not much that can be said on the subject with any degree of certainty. However, it is necessary to consider briefly the not infrequently mooted proposition that the Q text represents the Hesychian recension, the third text mentioned by Jerome in his Preface to Chronicles: "Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesycium laudat auctorem". According to a widespread opinion, this Hesychius is to be identified with the Egyptian bishop of the same name mentioned by Eusebius and said to have been martyred along with Phileas, Pachymius and Theodorus, presumably during the Diocletian persecution, c. 311 (HE VIII, 13.7).

The thesis that the Q text contains the Hesychian recension was suggested as early as 1890 by the Italian scholar Ceriani, following the same line of approach as in his identification of the Lucianic recension. He argued that there existed a close affinity between Q and the text presupposed by the Egyptian versions and the citations of Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).⁴⁹ Since then the identification has been several times restated.⁵⁰

But what is the evidence for Jer? As for the Egyptian versions, these definitely do not support Q. The Arabic consistently goes with the A text, whereas the Bohairic and Sahidic follow B. With regard to the citations of Cyril, these are notoriously erratic and cannot be classified with any text type in Jer. The sole example in Jer 29 is typical:

29:2 ὕδατα ἀναβαίνει] δη ὕδατα ἐρχεται C_p

But even more damaging to the Hesychian theory--at least to the Hesychius of popular identification-- is the chronological

factor. The traditional Hesychius is post-Origen, whereas the the revision behind Q is unquestionably pre-Origen. Of course, the link between the Hesychius of Jerome and the one mentioned by Eusebius is extremely tenuous at best and may not be the correct identification at all. Even so, this does not leave us with any positive reason for associating Jerome's Hesychius with our Q text.⁵¹

Having said this, however, we may still point out the likely Egyptian provenance of the Q text. There are three slight indicators which favour this view. First, there is the consideration that since the text was used by Origen it is likely to have circulated in Egypt prior to his time. Secondly, it is known that Codex Marchalianus, the chief representative of the Q group, was copied in Egypt.⁵² Thirdly, when there is a split in the evidence, the citations of the Egyptian commentator Olympiodorus (d. 510) often line up with Q. The following are the relevant readings from Jer 29:

29:9 βαθύνατε] + αυτοις A 106 410 Q-86'-233
-239-538-613 36-51-449 Olymp

29:9 ἐπ' αὐτόν 1°] om. ἐπ' Q 62 Olymp

29:16 μικρόν] pr. ἰδου A Q-V-86'-130-233-239-534
-544-613 L⁶² Olymp

29:19 κατοικήσει] ἐνοικήσει(-ση) B-S Q-130-239
-538-613 Olymp

The above data tend to confirm the view that the Q text was "at home" in Egypt, and may even have been produced there. But further than saying that it probably represents a very early Egyptian attempt to bring the Gk in line with the Heb, we may not go. Whether this reworking of the Gk text should be styled a "re-cension" is also an open question. Because so little is otherwise known of it and its guiding principles, we prefer to call

it simply a "revision" rather than a full-fledged "recension".

E. The A Group

It was observed in the previous section that Q readings were on several occasions supported by Codex Alexandrinus, sometimes joined by minuscules 106 and 410. Though quite small and loosely knit in comparison with previous groups, these three MSS constitute yet another MS cluster in the textual evidence for Jer. Each of the three MSS has its own highly individualistic traits, but enough occurrences remain where they bear witness to a common tradition. This tradition alternatively supports Q, B-S, O/L, or goes its own way entirely, sometimes joined by a few other minuscules.

Theories concerning date of copy for Codex Alexandrinus range from the late fourth century to the sixth century, but most often it is assigned to the fifth century, at least a century earlier than Codex Marchalianus. Its two congeners, 106 and 410, stem from the fourteenth and thirteenth century respectively. MS 106 (BM "p") is the only minuscule of those collated for Jer (except for 68 and 122 which are dependent on B) to contain the entire Bible. In Jer this minuscule is also unique for its order of the Oracles Against the Nations. Generally it follows the Heb internal order (though in the Gk position in the middle of the book) except that the Edom oracle follows that of the Philistines, as in the rest of the LXX tradition, and the Elam oracle is missing altogether. The MS is further noteworthy for its absence of titles in the OAN section (along with 538^{txt} and sometimes 46), the same phenomenon being observed in Is. MS 410 has been the hardest of all MSS to read. This is due to the fact that it is a palimpsest and also to the sloppy hand of the scribe. The following outline will be observed:

1. Readings Unique to Codex Alexandrinus
2. Readings in Common with Isolated Minuscules
3. Readings in Common with O/L

4. Readings in Common with Q-V
5. Readings in Common with B-S
6. Significance of the Data

1. Readings Unique to Codex Alexandrinus

- 29:2 ἀλαλάξουσιν] -ονται A
- 29:8 ἀπώλετο] επ. A
- 29:11 κατέσυρα] κατηραυνησα A
- 29:14 ὅτι 1^ο] om. A
- 29:19 καθίσει] κατοικησει A
- 29:19 κατοικήσει] καθειση A
- 29:20 Αἰθάμ] ηθαμ A
- 29:20 ἐπιστήσατε] -σεται A
- 29:21 ἐπ' αὐτούς] επ αυτη A

This codex contains a relatively high number of unique readings, some of which may be accidental, but others of which are evidently intentional and revisional. It is noteworthy that in the above list not one of the unique A readings constitutes an approximation to MT.⁵³

2. Readings in Common with Isolated Minuscules

- 29:2 κατοικοῦντας] ενοικ. A-106
 cf. 33:9 κατοικοῦντων] ενοικ. A-410
 8:16 κατοικοῦντας] ενοικ. 410

- 29:3 τροχῶν] πρ. των A-410
- 29:4 τοὺς καταλοίπους] τας καταλ. A-410 86
- 29:5 οἱ κατάλοιποι] τα καταλ. A-106
 cf. 23:3 τοὺς καταλοίπους] το καταλοιπον A
 5015 — " — — —] τους λοιπους A-106-410
- 29:6 μάχαιρα τοῦ κυρίου] om. του A-106-410 (κυριε) 88
- 29:7 ἡσυχάσει] -σεις A-410 = MT, cf. v.6
- 29:10 ὥς] ὡςπερ A-106-410 613; ὡσει Q-V+

When A is joined by minuscules only, it is clear that 106-410 form its most frequent allies (sometimes these also attest the reading of the group). The special readings of the A group so far noted concern minor variants of Gk synonyms, articles, conjunctions and the like. The only case of an approximation to the Heb (v.7) may be explained as a scribal assimilation to the same verb in the previous line.

3. Readings in Common with O and/or L

- 29:3 ἡχου] πρ. και A-106-410 534 613 L ≠ MT
- 29:12 χῆραι] πρ. αι A-106-410 233 239 613 L
- 29:16 ἔδωκα] δεδωκα A 26 233 L = parallel passage in Ob 2
- 29:16 ἐγκαταφρόνητον] πρ. και A-410 239 613 O ≠ MT
- 29:17 αὐτοῦ] σου A-106 239 86^{ms} O L = MT = Ob 4

When A stands alone against the other uncials, it is seldom supported by O L. In fact, it is possible that none of the above

readings derive from the Hexaplaric recension. Since the addition of καί in v. 16 does not conform to the Heb, its Hexaplaric origin is immediately in doubt. σου in v. 17 may have been gleaned from Ob 4, as was δίδωκα in v. 16 (the σου of v. 17 in O L 86^{mg}, however, comes from the Hexaplaric recension, having been compared with the Heb, not with Ob 4). The other instances of L support for A may be coincidental.

4. Readings in Common with Q-V

For this list of thirteen readings see above pp. 98-99.

5. Readings in Common with B-S

- 29:12 καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσονται A-106-410 B-S-239-538 C-613]
om. rel.
- 29:13 οἱς A-106-410 B-S-538 C] pr. ἰδοὺ rel.
- 29:18 συριεῖ A-106-410 B-S-130-538] εκσθησεται
(pr. συριεῖ C) καὶ συριεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶση τῇ πληγῇ
(πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν Q-239-613) αὐτῆς rel. = MT
- 29:21 ἐπ' αὐτὴν (αὐτὴ A) A-106-410 B-S-130-538]
ἐπ' αὐτοὺς rel. = MT
- 29:22 ὅτι A-106-410 B-S-130-239-538 36 C-613]
om. rel. = MT
- 29:22 καὶ A-106-410 B-S-239-538 C-613] om. rel. = MT

It is noteworthy that when the A group joins B-S against Q-V it stands on the side which does not approximate the Heb.

6. Significance of the Data

The findings of this section clearly show the idiosyncratic nature of the A group. Its penchant for numerous odd, though mostly minor, variations from the main Gk tradition is revealed in sub-sections 1 and 2. Sub-section 3 at first sight appears to demonstrate a degree of Hexaplaric and Lucianic influence on the text, but further examination shows that the shared readings may be coincidental. Sub-sections 4 and 5 indicate that A more frequently joins the Q group (hence strongly influenced by the pre-Hexaplaric revision) than the B group, but its vacillating tendency sets it apart from either. These facts taken together suggest that A, like the Catena group, is an eclectic or synthetic text, composed of elements from various strands, but (in contrast to the Catena group) including a strong dose of its own innovations. The early date of Codex Alexandrinus and the composite nature of its text hold out the possibility that among its component parts is preserved much ancient material, but at the same time its erratic behaviour demands great care in separating the grain from the chaff.

F. The B Group

The final group of MSS with which we have to deal consists of the two remaining uncials, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, sporadically followed by minuscules 130 239 538 and sometimes by 106 410. Whereas the grouping of minuscules in the Hexaplaric, Lucianic, and Catena texts was very clear-cut, the lines of demarcation between one group and another become increasingly blurred in these final three sections. This has reference especially to the minuscules, several of which are notoriously "mixed". That is why at this stage grouping of MSS becomes more a matter of degree and tendency than firm cohesion. Just as 106 and 410 were shown in certain readings to favour Codex Alexandrinus, so here 130, 239, and 538 in a number of crucial places side with Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.⁵⁴

As is well known, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are our oldest biblical codices, both stemming from the fourth century. Of the minuscules, 239 is the earliest, being copied in A.D. 1046. 130 and 538 hail from the twelfth to thirteenth centuries. The following brief outline will apply:

1. Readings of B-S+
2. Readings of B-S+ A
3. Readings of B-S+ Q(V)
4. Significance of the Data

1. Readings of B-S+

29:3 ἐφ' B-S-130] ἐπὶ rel.

29:10 ἦλθον B-S-538 106-410 Q^c C-613] + σοὶ rel. = MT

29:10 ὥς B-S] ὡς περ A-106 613 ; ὡσεὶ rel.

29:11 γείτονος B-S-130] πρ. καὶ rel. = MT

29:11 μου B-S-410] om. 106 ; αὐτοῦ (-των 534) rel. = MT

29:13 λέγει] εἶπεν B-S-538

29:13 ἰθὺς B-S-538 106-410] + ὅτι πινῶν πιεῖσαι
(with variations) rel. = MT

29:16 μικρόν B-S-538 106-410 C 26-46] πρ. ἰδοὺ rel. = MT

29:17 ὕψωσεν B-S-538 410] ὑψώσας 106 C = MT ;
ἐὰν ὑψώσης (-σεις παρ.) rel.

29:19 -κατοικήσει (-ση)] -ἐνοικήσει B-S ; ἐνοίκηση
130-239-538 Q-613 ; καθείστη A

- 29:21 ἐπ' αὐτοῦς Q-V+ = MT] επ αυτην B-S* (αυτη S^c)
-130-538 106-410
- 29:22 ἐφοβήθη B-S-538] εσ(ε)ισθη rel.
- 29:22 κραυγή σου ἐν θαλάσῃ] κραυγη θαλασσης ουκ B-S

2. Readings of B-S+ A

- 29:12 καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσονται B-S-239-538 A-106-410 C-613]
om. rel.
- 29:13 οἷς B-S-538 A-106-410 C] pr. ιδου rel. = MT
- 29:18 συριεῖ B-S-130-538 A-106-410] εκστησεται
(pr. συριει C) και συριει επι παση τη πληγη
(πασαν την πληγην Q-239-613) αυτης rel. = MT
- 29:22 ὅτι B-S-130-239-538 A-106-410 C-613 36]
om. rel. = MT
- 29:22 καὶ B-S-239-538 A-106-410 C-613] om. rel. = MT

3. Readings of B-S+ Q(V)

- 29:2 ἄπαντες B-S-130-410-538 Q-544 O C] παντες rel.
- 29:13 ἀθωωμένη B^c 311 26 46 410] αθωωμενη B*-S-538 Q;
αθωουμενη (αθουμενη) rel.
- 29:14 κατάρσιν B-130 410 Q-26-46-86'-233-534]
καταραν S-239 A-106 V-538-544 C-613 ;
επικαταραν L

29:14 εἰς αἰῶνα B-5-106-130-239 V-26-46-86'-534-544]
 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας A-410 Q-233-538-613 C;
 εἰς αἰῶνας O 51-449'; εἰς αἰῶνος L-51-449'

29:21 συμψηθοῦσι(ν) B-130-239 V-26-86'-534]
 συμ(vel συν.)ψηθοῦσι(ν) A-106 Q-46-544-613
 88 51-62-311-407-449' 490 538

4. Significance of the Data

The evidence of the above sub-sections is almost the exact reverse of the lists contained in the analysis of the Q group. When the B group stands alone against the other uncials it consistently supports the readings furthest from MT. The same pattern holds true even when it is joined by A. When the B group is supported by Q(V)+ it is usually only in matters of inner-Gk incidentals.

We may therefore make the following generalizations on behalf of the textual patterns that have emerged in Jer: When the authentic Hexaplaric and Lucianic elements have been eliminated, together with the mixed Catena text, there remain two firmly established textual traditions, the B group on the one hand and the Q group on the other hand, with A oscillating between the two. In the light of what has already been proved regarding the revisional character of the Q group, it is clear that B must represent the purer tradition of the two. It has not been affected seriously (or at all) by the pre-Hexaplaric revision Q, nor apparently by the later Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions; with regard to Jer at least, therefore, Jerome's comment noted above (p.30) appears to be an exaggeration. On the whole, its readings are to be preferred, unless cogent reason can be found to the contrary. When the A text joins B-S against Q-V, that reading must be deemed virtually certain as representing the old Gk, for in such cases A reinforces the unrevised tradition. By the same token, when B and Q groups agree against A, their readings are also to

be preferred in the light of the mixed and idiosyncratic nature of A. This is not to say that the B group must be preferred in every instance at any cost; it is by no means sacrosanct. It contains its own share of unique and improbable readings which have probably crept in at a later stage or through scribal carelessness. Some of these corruptions in the B group may have had the effect of pushing it away from MT where originally it was closer to MT; likewise, a Q reading need not automatically be considered a revised one; it may simply perpetuate an ancient original reading lost to B. When it is impossible to decide between two or more conflicting readings on the basis of the relative superiority of the textual traditions involved, then other factors have to be invoked (e.g., relevance to immediate context, translation pattern in the rest of the book, etc.). But where the B text makes tolerable sense and no reason can be given for it having suffered corruption or revision, its readings must weigh as a strong witness to the earliest recoverable text-form for this book.

CHAPTER 3

THE TEXT-CRITICAL PROBLEM (2): A CRITIQUE OF J. ZIEGLER'S CRITICAL EDITION OF JEREMIAH

As is well known and was mentioned in Ch.1 above (p.4), it was the Sixtine edition of 1587 which for generations held the field as the standard text of the LXX. For the book of Jer, under the circumstances, this was not an entirely unhappy event, since the Sixtine text is essentially an edited version of Codex Vaticanus, the backbone of the B group which, as has been shown in Ch 2, contains on the whole the best available witness to the archetype text of Jer. The situation would have been very different, for instance, if the text of the Complutensian Polyglot had gained prominence as the textus receptus.¹ Yet simply to perpetuate the printing of edited copies of Codex Vaticanus was obviously not the way forward, neither in Jer nor in any other book. The various editions and revisions of the Sixtine text that did appear amounted simply to cosmetic touchups and to different sets of compromises between the readings of B* and B^c. The same judgment must even be passed on Swete's text.² However good in a general sort of way Codex Vaticanus might be in Jer, neither B* nor B^c could possibly hope in every detail to represent the earliest text. Far from it, almost every page of the codex gives evidence of the kind of scribal errors and ailments that all MSS are heir to. Even if we allow some of its unique readings and orthography to be corrected by its larger group, we cannot simply assume without further ado that the B group always preserves the best reading either. What is needed is a thorough analysis of all the evidence--realistically defined--for all the readings.

This was the task assigned to J. Ziegler and the fruits of his scholarly investigation are embodied in his Göttingen edition

and satellite studies.³ In this chapter we shall be concerned to discover and evaluate the text-critical principles operative not only in the formation of Ziegler's text itself, but also in the structure and content of the critical apparatuses, for it is evident that the editor's hand is very much involved in the composition of each of these vital stages. The material will therefore be discussed according to the following outline:

- I. Critique of Ziegler's First Apparatus
 - A. Format
 - B. Selectivity
 - C. Reliability
- II. Critique of Ziegler's Second Apparatus
 - A. Format
 - B. Selectivity
 - C. Reliability
- III. Critique of Ziegler's Reconstructed Text
 - A. Editorial Miscellanea
 - 1. Chapter and Verse Divisions
 - 2. Punctuation and Capitalization
 - 3. Orthography and Accentuation
 - B. Choice of Readings
 - 1. Choice of B Group Readings
 - 2. Choice of Other MS Readings
 - 3. Choice of Conjectural Emendations

I. Critique of Ziegler's First Apparatus

An apparatus of variant readings in a critical edition of an ancient work is no ancillary or optional adjunct to the printed text; rather, it constitutes an absolutely indispensable complement without which the proposed text cannot be evaluated. It is at the same time the bedrock of information upon which the critical text is built and from where its readings are quarried. The editor must at every point make known the choice of readings available to him and to present this information in as clear and

systematic a way as possible so that the interested reader can quickly be orientated in the relative strength and weakness of competing readings. Format, selectivity, and reliability are therefore the main ingredients by which an apparatus must be judged. The first apparatus of Ziegler's edition is intended to present the variants to the text of the LXX proper; the second apparatus is reserved for readings attested by other Gk versions.

A. Format

In the case of the LXX an editor is responsible for documenting three main sources of variants to the adopted text: Gk MSS, patristic citations, and daughter versions. But opinions divide over which is the preferred order of notation. Ziegler's apparatus (in conformity with the then reigning Göttingen policy) follows the order of Gk MSS, daughter versions, and patristic citations, but this has the disadvantage of driving a wedge between the two main bodies of Gk evidence, the MSS and the patristic citations. Commencing with the 1974 edition of Genesis edited by J.W. Wevers the Gk patristic evidence is now placed ahead of the versions in the Göttingen series so that all the Gk witnesses are grouped together, and this method has much to recommend it (see Wevers, Genesis, p. 64).⁴

Of the three sources of possible variants, the most important are the Gk MSS themselves. Following the recommendation by Lagarde (Pars Prior, p. xvi; "Noch einmal", Mittheilungen, III, p. 230), and in conformity with general practice in the editing of classical texts, Göttingen procedure is, as far as possible, to cite variant readings by groups rather than by individual MSS. As Ch. 2 of our investigation has shown, the existence of such groups among MSS of Jer is a given fact so that the method is eminently suited for the documentation of variants at least for this book. Where the cohesion among the members of a group is particularly firm, such groups may be represented by a single symbol, e.g. O, L, C, from which any deviating MSS may be appropriately indicated by superscripts, e.g. L^{-51 449'}. Even sub-groups within

the main groups can be accommodated to this system so that in Jer Jm Ziegler indicates the members of the Lucianic "Hauptgruppe" by L, the "Untergruppe" by l, and the combined witness of L and l by L' (similarly in the case of the Catena group, C + c = C').⁵ For groups less stable in composition Ziegler prefers to cite all attesting MSS joined by hyphens, e.g. Q-V-26-46-86-534-544-613. Generally these groups are cited according to a consistent order: the B group, the A group, the Q group, the O group, the L group, and finally the C group. The B group naturally heads the list as the generally most reliable pre-Hexaplaric text. This is followed by the A group which stands logically between the B and Q groups whose readings it alternatively supports. The Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions follow in their chronological order, and the list is completed by the Catena group, a late textual synthesis which draws its readings from previous traditions.

The above pattern for recording the Gk MS evidence forms a useful model by which to arrange the material and guide the reader. Unfortunately, the classification of the evidence does not always fit into neatly pre-arranged categories, so that in practice various modifications of the format have to be resorted to. Particularly problematic are a number of the minuscules which frequently change their loyalties and are therefore difficult to classify. Some might easily qualify for the designation "codices mixti", except for the fact that Ziegler is loathe to reserve any special category for "codices mixti" and prefers instead wherever possible to associate them with some established group.⁶ This is done by the extensive use of hyphens, by which means Ziegler gives expression to his critical judgement on the interdependence of as many readings as possible in the apparatus. For instance, although MSS 130 239 538 are classed with the B group, frequently they do not support this group but some other reading. In such cases they are variously joined to the Q group, the Lucianic (except 239), or the Catena group (except 130 538). Instances where 130 239 538 are joined to the Q group abound, e.g.

29:9 βαθύνετε] + εαυτοις (-τους 87 538 ; εν αυτοις 106)
 A-106' Q-86'-233-239-538-613, 29:10 καταλειμμα] καταλ(ε)ιμματα
 A Q-V-46-86'-130-233-538-544. When 130 does not support the B

group it is always linked to the Q group, the only exception to this being in chapters 1-9 where it is under Lucianic influence (via 311, see Ieremias, p. 83) so that in that section it is attached to L in cases where it neither supports B nor Q, e.g. 6:27 $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\epsilon$ Syh L¹-130¹-613. Whenever 239 supports a reading attested by both the Q and C groups (but not by B), then preference is given to the Q group as the stronger loyalty e.g. 29:9 $\beta\alpha\theta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\tau\epsilon$] + $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ A-106¹ Q-86¹-233-239-538-613 36-51-449 C¹, but sometimes 239 shows stronger Catena influence and is then linked to that group, e.g. 29:12 $\chi\eta\rho\alpha\iota$] pr. $\alpha\iota$ A-106¹ C¹-239-613 233 (see discussion, Ieremias, p. 94). Whenever 538 supports a reading attested by both the Q and L groups (but not by B), then preference is given to the L group as the stronger influence, e.g. 29:9 $\epsilon\pi'\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon$] om. $\epsilon\pi$ A V-86¹-239-534-544 O L³⁶-538 (see discussion, Ieremias, p. 83).

MSS 106 410 (106-410 = 106¹) are properly classified with the A group, but sometimes they support the B group instead. In such cases they are cited as integral members of the B group, e.g. 29:10 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$ B-S-106¹-538. When 106 and 410 support neither the A nor the B groups they are usually left to stand alone or are sometimes joined to the Q group; no example in Ch. 29 exists but cf. 28:56 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$] \omicron $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\nu$ S^c V-26-46-86*-106-534-538-544-710 O-233.

In Ziegler's text 233 is classified either with the Hexaplaric recension, the Q group, or on occasion with the L group. On the basis of many passages where 233 attests passages sub asterisco in the Hexaplaric recension or eliminates passages sub obelo in the Hexaplaric recension, Ziegler prefers wherever possible to link 233 to the O group, e.g. 29:22 om. $\omicron\tau\iota$ Q-V-26-46-86¹-534-544 O-233. Where 233 has a different reading from O then it is normally joined to the Q group, e.g. 29:9 $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ A-106¹ Q-86¹-233-239-538-613; sometimes (though not in our chapter) to the L group. But with 233 there is a special problem in that its character seems to change precisely in the OAN section. Whereas outside this section 233 frequently supports O readings under an asterisk or eliminates readings under an obelus, I have been

unable to find a single instance of this in Chs. 25-31 of the LXX. Here 233 supports an O reading only if that O reading is in turn supported by the Q group, the pre-Hexaplaric revision. The conclusion seems inescapable that in this section 233 is a witness to the Q group rather than the O group and should accordingly be linked only with the former, in contrast to Ziegler's preference to link it to O.

MS 613 is classified with the Q group, but not infrequently it follows the C group instead, e.g. 29:3 ἡχοῦ } pr. καὶ C'-613. Where 613 supports a reading attested by both Q and C groups then Ziegler always gives the preference to the Q group e.g. 29:9 βαθύναι } + αὐτοῖς A-106' Q-86'-233-239-538-613 36-51-449 C' (see Ieremias, p. 94). Sometimes, though not in our chapter, it is linked (along with 239) to the L group (see discussion, Ieremias, p. 83).

Another problem has to do with MS 51. As has already been mentioned, this MS contains the section of the Oracles Against the Nations twice, once in the middle of the book in the usual Gk position and order, and once at the end in the Heb order (51^s). This fact, however, is nowhere pointed out in Ziegler's edition, either because he thought it not worthwhile mentioning or, what is more likely, because he did not know about the existence of the second section since only the first section had been collated in the Unternehmen's special collation books. The matter is of some interest since the two sections contain a slightly different text. Ziegler has classified 51 with the Lucianic "Hauptgruppe" but in the Oracles against the Nations at least it is only 51^s that belongs to the "Hauptgruppe", 51 being definitely allied with 449 and the "Untergruppe".⁷

The only occasions on which Ziegler will permit a collection of "codices mixti" is where no group exists with which the isolated minuscules may be classified, e.g. 29:2 αλλ' αὐτοῖς (46 106* 544, or if a group exists, no precedent is present for associating a particular minuscule with the group(s) in question,

e.g. 29:17 $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ $\underline{O} \underline{L'}^{-62}$ 87 46 106 239 613^c 710. In such cases the minuscules are relegated to the end of an entry listed in their numerical order of ascendancy, but if one of the minuscules happens to come from one of the "firm" groups, i.e. O L C, then a member of that group always takes precedence; therefore in the reading $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ from 29:17 quoted above, 87 precedes the list of 46 106 239 613^c 710 because 87 is a member of the C group. Some of the decisions when to associate a straying minuscule with a group and when not to are necessarily subjective and the editor's reasoning is not always immediately obvious.⁸ However, of one thing we may be sure, that the arrangement of the MSS in the apparatus is not arbitrary but is intended to reflect the editor's judgement on the interdependence of readings among the various MSS, in so far as this is possible. On the whole one has to assign a high degree of credibility to Ziegler's judgements.

The principles of grouping by the use of symbols and hyphens is reserved in the Göttingen texts only for Gk MSS, yet a logical extension of this method might have been to apply it to the patristic citations and daughter versions as well. For instance, at 29:5 instead of simply listing the witnesses for the reading $\tau\alpha \lambda\omicron\iota\pi\alpha$ as $\underline{L'}$ Chr Tht,⁹ why could these not be joined by hyphens, since the readings of Chrysostom and Theodoret are clearly dependent on the Lucianic recension? Similarly the reading $\tau\omega\nu \epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ in 29:5 could be $\underline{L'}$ -Chr-Tht, in 29:6 $\epsilon\omega\varsigma \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon \sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\eta\sigma\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $\underline{L'}$ -Syh^{mg}-Tht, in 29:14 $\beta\omicron\sigma\omicron\rho$ $\underline{L'}$ -Chr-Tht. The same applies to the versions. The Latin, Coptic, and Ethiopic versions usually support the B group, the Arabic follows the A group, and the Armenian joins the O group. Thus instead of the notation at 29:11 $(\tau\omicron) \sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ \underline{O} -Q^{mg} $\underline{L'}$ Arm Tht, this could better be represented as \underline{O} -Q^{mg}-Arm $\underline{L'}$ -Tht. Likewise in 29:12 we could have $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\gamma\omega \zeta\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ B-S-239-538-Co-Aeth A-106'-Arab, at 29:13 $\omicron\iota\varsigma$ B-S-538-Co-Aeth A-106'-Arab, at 29:14 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \alpha\phi\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\iota\varsigma \omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\iota\varsigma \alpha\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ \underline{O} -Arm $\underline{L'}$ -Tht, at 29:17 $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ 88(sub \times)-Arm $\underline{L'}$ -Syh^{mg}-Tht. Admittedly the patristic and versional evidence is often quite

erratic so that the attempt at grouping these might involve more trouble than it is worth, but at least on principle there is no reason why the group method should not also be extended to these.

Another device employed by Ziegler to indicate relationships among readings of various MSS--or the lack of such relationships, as the case may be--is that of spacing. Sometimes, indeed, it is difficult to tell whether a particular manner of spacing is due to the mechanics of type-setting or whether it was deliberately intended by Ziegler. But close familiarity with Ziegler's apparatus reveals the existence of certain intentional features. In general, main groups of MSS are separated by a relatively large space, whereas isolated minuscules, the versions, and patristic citations at the end of an entry are closely spaced, e.g. 29:17 σσ
 A-106 Q-86^{mg} L' 239 La^{Sg} Aeth Arab Arm Tht. But sometimes these spaces are expanded or contracted apparently according to Ziegler's interpretation of the degree of independence or dependence among the various witnesses. Three examples will illustrate the process. At 29:12 the reading ζήσῃται is cited as follows, B^c Q-233 106(-σῃται)-410 130 613, with an unusually long space between B^c and Q-233. Probably by this means Ziegler intends to convey the message that he sees no connection between the same reading in B^c and the Hexaplaric recension. The true reading he believes has been preserved in Q-233 and some other minuscules, whereas it has been secondarily corrected in B independent of these sources. At 29:16 the reading μικρόν is supported by B-S-106'-538 C' 26 46, with C' being placed unusually close to the B group. Ziegler's interpretation is probably that the C' group reading μικρόν (without the preceding ἰδοὺ as in most other MSS) is directly dependent on the B group. At 29:23 the reading πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ is supported by Syh L' C'-613 534, this time with an uncommonly narrow space between the L' and C' groups; here Ziegler's message must be that the C' group reading on this occasion derives from the L' recension. The net effect of this use of spacing is to engage the reader in a kind of running commentary on the editor's view of the interdependence obtaining among several

variants in the apparatus. It is another technique which enlivenes the presentation of data which could otherwise be quite mechanical and dull.

In addition to citing variant readings in the manner described above, Ziegler skilfully uses the first apparatus to communicate much other information needful for a better understanding of the text and its variants. Cross-references to other versions, editions, parallel passages, and grammars are an important feature of this supplementary information. Agreements between the variants and the MT are clearly indicated, e.g. 29:1 * *ος ενενηθη* *λογος κυριου προς ιερεμιαν τον προφητην* 88 = MT↓, the downward pointing arrow being an internal cross-reference to the second apparatus drawing attention to agreements with the readings of other Gk versions. When the Gk variant is similar to but not identical with the MT this is indicated by the use of the abbreviation "cf." e.g. 29:22 *ηκουσθη*] + (η) *φωνη σου* L' Arm: cf. MT (MT has *ηλρ* not *τηλρ*). Similarly, agreements with the Peshitta text and with the Complutensian, Aldine, and Sixtine editions are carefully noted, e.g. 29:18 *πας*] *pr. και* Q Bo Arab Arm = Pesh; 29:3 *πολλων* 130 538 = Compl. To these sources could now be added the agreements with the Qumran texts. Thus at 29:4 the apparatus might note that *καὶ ἀφανισ* = 2QJer. Valuable, too, are the cross-references to other Gk passages, whether in the book of Jer or in some other biblical book. In the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, 36 variants are cross-indexed in this way. For instance, at 29:2 the variants *την γην*, *πολις*, and *ενοικουντας* are each cross-indexed to 8:16 where we find a parallel passage to 29:2 containing some of the same type of variants. These cross-references are extremely useful in helping to form a picture of the patterns that often exist among certain variants and MSS. For example, the variants for *κατοικοῦντο* / *ενοικοῦντο* are as follows:

<u>8:16</u>	<i>κατοικοῦντας</i> }	<i>ενοικουντας</i>	410 ⊆
<u>29:2</u>	<i>κατοικοῦντας</i> }	<i>ενοικουντας</i>	A-106
<u>33:9</u>	<i>κατοικούντων</i> }	<i>ενοικουντων</i>	A-410

Evidently the revision underlying the A group had a preference for the $\acute{\epsilon}\nuοικου\acute{\nu}\tauοι$ form. Indirectly this method of cross-reference also has the advantage of helping the reader to identify many of the parallel passages which exist both within and outside the book of Jer; in addition to 29:2b//8:16b see several points of comparison in the apparatus between 29:15-17 and Ob 1-4, 29:18 and 19:8, 29:19-21 and 27:40, 44-45. A notable omission among the cross-references is the lack of any mention of the intriguing phenomenon in certain MSS (especially 106 and 538^{txt}) which omits the titles of the oracles against the nations and other titles. Further examination reveals that this pattern extends even into the book of Isaiah, a feature that ought surely to have been noted in apparatus.¹⁰

Ziegler's apparatus also contains several cross-references to Thackeray's Grammar for the explanation of different grammatical forms. Thus for an explanation of the variant middle form $\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\acute{\xi}\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ at 29:2 in A (in contrast to the majority text reading $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$) we are referred to p. 231 of Thackeray's Grammar. These references could now be profitably expanded by making use of Walter's more up to date study, The Text of the Septuagint. Hence Ziegler's adoption at 29:13 of the form $\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$ rather than $\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$ as in the majority of MSS could be backed up by a reference to Walters, p. 75.

Yet other miscellaneous information contained in the apparatus includes the citation of patristic comments on the existence of early variant readings (see above p. 3, n. 5), and the source of a conjectural emendation, e.g. 29:3 $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\nu$ Schleusner II 845 (some emendations not adopted by Ziegler are also included in the apparatus when he considers these worthy of mention, e.g. 27:8 $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$] $\tau\rho\alpha\gamma\omicron\iota$ Cappelus apud Schleusner I 641; $\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ Spohn).

Certain features of the apparatus are evidently designed to conserve space. Thus while it would have been ideal to cite all

the evidence both for the "variants" as well as for the adopted reading or "lemma text", (as Ziegler himself realizes; Ieremias, p. 138), Ziegler's general rule, with certain exceptions,¹¹ is to cite the evidence for one side of the equation only, leaving the reader to deduce the MSS relevant for the other side if interested, which are often subsumed under the convenient abbreviation "rel." But this policy imposes heavy demands on the reader: to determine at any one point exactly which witnesses support a particular reading not detailed in the apparatus, he has to subtract all those MSS and versions which have been cited from the total number of witnesses attested for that book, a task which is complicated by the fact that some witnesses are extant for certain portions only.¹² What is absolutely essential, therefore, is a clear and full reckoning on each page of precisely which MSS and versions have been collated for the passage covered on that page. This type of MS "heading list" (Kopfleiste) inserted between the text proper and first apparatus has been introduced in the latest editions of the Göttingen series and it is a welcome and useful aid (Wevers, Genesis, pp. 63-64). If this had been done for Jer every page of Ch. 29 would have had the following Kopfleiste: B-S-130-239-538 A-106' Q-V-26-46'-86'-233-534-544-613 O L' C' verss.

Sometimes Ziegler saves space by omitting the lemma text altogether in the apparatus, e.g. 29:8 $\epsilon\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ A. This type of notation can be used only sparingly and under special circumstances where there can be no confusion as to what word the variant refers to (in 29:8 $\epsilon\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ is clearly a variant of $\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$), though vertical lines used as division markers between variant readings help to avoid confusion. Finally, Ziegler saves space by not separating the variants for different verses into paragraphs. But this is counterproductive as the reader is frequently frustrated by not being able to locate quickly his desired reading in the apparatus. In the new editions of the Göttingen series this problem has been corrected by the use of paragraph units and the references are consequently more easily located.

B. Selectivity

A comparison between the collation notes and Ziegler's apparatus shows that many readings contained in the notes are not included in Ziegler's apparatus. This is not surprising, since the abundance of mere scribal or clerical variants demands that some form of selectivity be exercised in the choice of readings to be included in the main apparatus lest it become overloaded and unwieldy. Ziegler's general policy is to include in the apparatus only such readings as could be called variants of substance, that is, different vocabulary, or significantly different forms of a word in terms of number, tense, mood, or case. A sampling of the typical kind of orthographic variant found in the MSS is reserved for a special section of the "Einleitung" (pp. 109-125), keyed to Thackeray's Grammar. To demonstrate Ziegler's method we will compare the readings contained in the collation notes of 29:2 with those included in his apparatus and in the orthographic section of the "Einleitung".

ὁδατα ἀναβαίνει

For this "variation unit" we find the following alternative readings:

ὁδατα	ἀναβειννι	A
"	-βειννι	S*
"	-βειν	26
"	-βαιννι	62
"	-βαιν	239
δη	"	ερεται Cyril of Alexandria

Since the different forms attested for the verb ἀναβαίνει all constitute variations in scribal spelling without changing the tense, mood, or number of the verb, they are not included in the main apparatus. However, in the section of the "Orthographika" under the sub-heading of the interchange of νν and ν (p. 120), are listed the forms ἀναβειννι S*, ἀναβειννι A, and ἀναβαιννι 62 of 29:2. The vocalic variants ἀναβειν

and ἀναβαίνῃ of 26 and 239 respectively are nowhere mentioned in Ziegler's text. By contrast, however, Cyril of Alexandria's phrase δὴ ὕδατα ἔρχεται is of a different order altogether containing a true vocabulary alternative with the addition of a particle. This is the only phrase, therefore, which is included in Ziegler's main apparatus as a variant of ὕδατα ἀναβαίνει.

ἀπό

The reading ἐπὶ in 106 is a different preposition from that contained in the other MSS and is therefore included in the apparatus.

βορρᾶ

For this word there is only one variant spelling attested, namely βορραῦ in S*. This is not included in the apparatus, but on p. 123 we find the notation, "Der Genetiv βορρᾶ ist in S* gewöhnlich βορραῦ geschrieben: 13:20 16:15 23:8 25:9 27:9,41 23:2."

καὶ ἔσται

The words are missing in the Latin work Speculum while S* has the itacistic variant εσσε. Neither is deemed sufficiently important to merit mention in the apparatus.

χειμάρρουν

The Gk variants attested for this word are χειμάρρουν A, χειμάρρον S* (-ρρουν S^c), and χειμάρρον 534. Since these are of mere orthographic nature with no possible change in meaning they are excluded from the main apparatus. However, two of the variants, those of S* and 534, are listed on p. 112 as illustrative of the interchange of ου - ο, ο - ου. The Bohairic version has the plural variant "torrentes" but this receives no mention in the apparatus.

κατακλύσει

For this word the following variants are attested: κατακλυσί A S*, κατακλυσζει 46, κλυσσει 534, and κατακαυσει 239 410. The form in A S* is another case of itacism and consequently not recorded in the apparatus; however, a note on p. 112 informs that the interchange of ι-ει and ει-ι is very common in the MSS, especially in S and A, exactly as we find in 29:2. The reading κατακλυσζει of 46 represents a different tense of the verb and is on that account included in the apparatus, as is the simplex form of the verb found in 534. κατακαυσει in 239 410 constitutes a different verb altogether and must likewise be listed in the apparatus.

καί 2°, 3°, 4°, 5°

There are all together five instances of the conjunction καί in 29:2. The first καί is attested by all witnesses, but the second is omitted by 407, the third by the Armenian version, the fourth by the Ethiopic version, and the fifth by the Coptic and Armenian versions. Of these Ziegler notes in his apparatus only the omission of the fifth conjunction in the Coptic and Armenian versions. It is not obvious why Ziegler made an exception in the case of the fifth conjunction, unless he felt that the witness of two versions, one of these being the relatively important Coptic (=Sahidic + Bohairic), made it noteworthy. In the case of the other omissions he undoubtedly felt they were accidental and inconsequential. Such decisions are subjective, but it is true that not much hangs on the omission of a conjunction in a few minor witnesses.

γην

In 449* and 538 γην is preceded by the article την . This must be recorded in the apparatus since the presence or absence of the article in the LXX of Jer constitutes a special problem, e.g., in the parallel passage of 8:16 the article is attested by B-S-538 A-106' V-86'-198-544 36 c.

πόλιν

For this word the variant πόλις is found in S* and 544, though Ziegler is undoubtedly correct in suggesting that the intended form in S* 544 is the accusative plural πολεις, the -ις form being a case of itacism, cf. 29:14 πόλις] πόλις S*. In either case, whether the variant form is taken to be the nominative singular or the accusative plural, it correctly merits mention in the apparatus. The Armenian version which also has the plural form could easily have been added to the notation but Ziegler chose to omit it.

κατοικοῦντας

The only variant form for this word is ενοικουντας in A 106; the same kind of variants are found in 8:16 and 33:9 and these are always recorded by Ziegler.

κεκράζονται

The simple (rather than reduplicated) middle future form κραζονται is found in S* 62 86^c. Ziegler records only S* 62 though the same form is definitely found in 86 as a correction over a previous erasure. The reduplicated middle future form was standard in Attic and generally throughout the LXX, whereas the simple middle future appears as variants in the LXX (cf. Thackeray, Grammar, p. 273); in Jer these are found in various MSS at 22:20 30:3 31:20 32:20, always recorded in full by Ziegler.

οἱ ἄνθρωποι

The article οἱ is omitted in 87, obviously by scribal lapse, but the omission is nonetheless documented by Ziegler. Speculum attests the variant universi, not very significant but still included in Ziegler's apparatus.

ἀλλὰ λ᾿ἔουσιν

The variant ἀλλὰ λ᾿ἔονται in A is the middle future of the same verb as main text (cf. Thackeray, Grammar, p. 231); the variants ἀλλὰ λ᾿ἔουσιν(ν) in 46 106* 544 and οὐλοῦσιν (ν) (22*-48*-449) of L' constitute different verbs altogether. All are correctly recorded by Ziegler.

κατοικοῦντες

S* has the common itacism -ταῖς so characteristic of this codex; obviously it is not worthy of mention in the main apparatus.

Review of the above examples well illustrates how Ziegler seeks to distinguish between immaterial and material variants, only the latter of which are accorded a place in his LXX apparatus; the former may be listed in the "Einleitung" or not mentioned at all. It is of course true that the distinction between significant and insignificant variants cannot be made absolutely. A scholar studying scribal habits and orthographic patterns in the MSS would find the term "insignificant" applied to such variants offensive; but for the general reader they are certainly secondary and if they were included in the main apparatus would tend to confuse rather than aid in his understanding of the text. While one has to admire the diligence with which Swete, for instance, recorded all the minute variants attested by the uncials collated by him, one has at the same time to admit that much of his apparatus served no useful purpose for the average reader. The function of the textual critic is surely to use his expertise in weighing the MS information and in deciding what is relevant and what is not, lest the non-expert entirely lose his way in the forest of meaningless clerical mistakes and idiosyncrasies. On occasion Ziegler does include in his apparatus forms which are purely orthographic, i.e. forms which do not change the meaning of a word in any way. Thus at 29:13 we have the entry ἀθωμμένη B^c 311 26 46 410 Th

αθωμ. B*-S-538 Q; αθωουμένη (vel. αθουουμ.) rel.

In the light of the predominant αθo. spelling in the MSS Ziegler evidently considered this orthographic variant worthy of mention in the apparatus. But he is curiously inconsistent in not mentioning the same kind of variants in ἄθωωθῆς of the same verse where B*-S-538 A 86 91-490 have αθoωθης and Q has αθoωθηση (not αθωωθηση as the apparatus seems to say). Whether the notation was really necessary in the first place may be disputed (it probably should have been reserved for the section of the "Orthographika", especially since other examples of ἄθoωv / ἄθoωv are mentioned there, p. 112), but it goes to show that Ziegler has probably included more rather than less of what is really essential.

When a decision has been made to enter a certain word in the apparatus, normally all the attesting Gk MSS of this variant are cited. Occasionally, however, in the case of minor variants, the designation "alii" is employed to signify additional miscellaneous minuscules, e.g. 29:6 ἡσυχάσεις]-σης 87 alii (alii here includes 233 311 534).

In the case of the daughter versions Ziegler is much more selective in what he includes in the apparatus compared with the Gk MSS. Often, for instance, the versions add or omit conjunctions and particles, change the number of a noun or pronoun, inadvertently omit or transpose words and phrases. Such variants are usually ignored by Ziegler unless they happen also to be attested by a Gk MS or patristic citation. For instance, in 29:3 we find the entry ἡχου] pr. καὶ A-106' L' C'-613 534 Bo Arab; pr. et a Aeth Arm Spec. But the very next word τροχῶν is also followed by a conjunction in the Bohairic and Armenian versions; this, however, is not recorded by Ziegler. Sometimes one feels versional evidence could profitably have been included that is actually omitted. For example, at 29:3 the word οπλων can be read either as ὀπλῶν (from ὀπλή , "hoof") or ὀπλων (from ὀπλον , pl. "arms"). The context clearly requires the meaning "hoofs", yet it is significant that the

Ethiopic, Syriac, Arabic, and Armenian versions all read "arms", as did Speculum. Regrettably this failed to be mentioned by Ziegler.

The Gk patristic evidence is generally cited in full; it is sometimes cited for the lemma text even when the rest of the Gk evidence for it is not provided.¹³ Documentation of the Latin citations, e.g. from Speculum, is less consistent. Thanks to the work of the Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristique at Strasbourg, fresh and comprehensive documentation of patristic citations and allusions are now available in the published volume Biblia Patristica (1975) covering the period from the Apostolic Fathers to Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Nothing new was discovered in this volume which had not been already noted by Ziegler, but in a special request relating to Jer 29 the Centre kindly provided me with four additional citations/allusions from their current files. These include one Gk citation from Didymus the Blind (see above, p.) and three less important Latin allusions (see above, p. n.). Additionally there are individual studies such as the one by Otto Wahl (1965) on the text of Sacra Parallela prepared especially to provide the Göttingen editions with further reliable patristic material. Although collated in the Unternehmen's collation books, the readings of the late Church Father Basilus of Neopatrae are hardly ever referred to in Ziegler's critical apparatus. Nor is it important that they should be; Basilus attests a text very similar to 239.

C. Reliability

My independent collation of the MS evidence for Jer 29 has confirmed the general reliability and accuracy of the Göttingen apparatus. Nevertheless, the investigation also revealed numerous instances where the collators of the Unternehmen's special collation books failed to record or incorrectly recorded certain readings. Those readings which I found to bear directly on material contained in Ziegler's apparatus were communicated to

the Unternehmen, and several of these corrections were incorporated into the 1976 reprint of the book. A comparison of the two printings will show that the following modifications have been admitted to the apparatus of Jer 29:

Additions (those doubly underlined)

29:2 γῆν] pr. την 449* 538

29:6 ἀνάπαυσαι] pr. και C' - 613

29:9 Δεδαν 407 538 544

29:14 εἰς αἰῶνα] εις αιωνος O 51-449

29:15 ἀπέστειλε] εξαπεστειλε(ν) C - 613 534

29:17 ἐνεχείρησε] ενεχειρισε(ν) O L' - 62 87 46 106 239 613^c 71c

29:23 ὥσεται] αναβησεται και επιστησεται (επιπτησεται
62-407-449 = l)

Deletions (those underlined)

29:2 ἀλαλάξουσιν] ολολυξουσι (-λυξ. 22*-48*-449)

29:8-9 αὐτῶν, ἡπατήθη τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν] om. αυτων^ αυτων
87 106

Other suggestions also made but not adopted in the new edition were the following:

Additions

29:1 Ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις] + ος (ως 22^c - 62) εγενετο...

29:2 κεκράξονται] κρξονται S* 62 86^c

29:14 κατάρασιν] επικαταρασιν L' Chr Tht

29:14 ἔση] > 710 Chr

29:17 τρυμαλιάς] εν τρυμαλιαίς 88-Syh^m L⁻⁵¹ -62-407

29:17 ὕψωσεν] εν υψωσης (-σεις A 26 239 86^m)

29:19 αἱ] οἱ 88 613

Deletions

29:11 τὰ κρυπτά] om. τα Tht

The 1976 edition of Ieremias is not a thoroughgoing revision of the text nor the apparatus; rather it is essentially a reprint of the 1957 edition with miscellaneous alterations which had come to the attention of the Unternehmen incorporated where the mechanics of type-setting allowed for this without major reworking. Thus my corrections were adopted where it was convenient to do so in terms of space available. However, there is nothing to suggest that there has been any revision of the apparatus elsewhere.¹⁴ With regard to the Gk. evidence, therefore, the conclusion remains true that while in the great majority of instances Ziegler's apparatus is to be relied upon as trustworthy, allowance has to be made for a certain margin of error.

With regard to the daughter versions I have had to rely on the Göttingen collation notes (the versions were added by Ziegler himself). We can safely assume a high degree of accuracy in the collation of these, though in the case of some, e.g. the Bohairic, Arabic, and Armenian, the collation was done on the basis of published editions, some of known inferior quality. The patristic evidence has also been collated on the basis of published editions rather than MSS (an exception being the commentary of Olympiodorus), whose accuracy obviously cannot be

vouchsafed for either. Ideally all versions and patristic citations would have been based on actual MSS or good critical editions, but to have undertaken this immense work for what is after all only secondary evidence would hardly have been proportionate to the effort expended. In time, no doubt, good critical editions of most of these works will also appear in their own right¹⁵ and the material can then be reviewed again if so desired. In the meantime, the best available sources were used and this is all that can be expected.

II. Critique of Ziegler's Second Apparatus

"Eine Ausgabe der Septuaginta ohne vollständige Aufnahme des sogenannten hexapalrischen Materials halte ich für unwissenschaftlich," said Paul de Lagarde in 1889 ("Noch einmal", Mittheilungen, III, 234), an opinion which today is taken as axiomatic. Yet curiously Rahlfs's 1926 edition of Genesis contained no documentation of the Hexapla readings. The first edition to contain this material was Ziegler's Isaias (1939), where the policy was adopted of employing two separate apparatuses, one for the variant readings of the LXX (including recensions such as O and L) and one for the readings of other Gk versions, principally those deriving from the various columns of the Hexapla (cf. Isaias, pp. 111-115).

There can be little doubt that the two-apparatus structure is of great practical value in arranging the complex body of material at hand, yet there lurks beneath the surface of this model a deeper question concerning its methodological validity. The two-apparatus model serves to emphasize the editor's view that readings in the second apparatus are not properly variants of the LXX but constitute readings from other translations in their own right to be compared with the LXX. In the latest editions of the Göttingen series this distinction has been sharpened even further by providing all readings in the second apparatus with accents and breathings just as in the critically restored LXX text. (cf. Wevers, Genesis, pp. 59-60). Yet it is ironic that the Göttingen editors have chosen to emphasize the

difference between the kinds of readings contained in the two apparatuses just at the time when the traditional view of the relationship between the various Gk texts is being seriously challenged. In his seminal and revolutionary study, Les Devanciers d' Aquila, D. Barthélemy argued that, far from being an entirely new translation, even such a text as that of the literal Aquila represents the end product of a long process of revision of the basic text, antecedents of which were discovered in the so-called Kaige recension (to be traced even in certain readings added to the LXX of Jer, Devanciers, p. 44). Similar claims have been made for the translation of Theodotion, cf. the study by Kevin G. O'Connell, The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus (1972). The net effect of these and other studies is to put in question the traditional hard and fast distinction between recension and version, and instead to underline the interdependence among the various forms of the Gk texts current in the early centuries. If this new orientation to the early history of the Gk OT gains widespread credibility the formal differentiation implied in the Göttingen two-apparatus structure will no doubt be increasingly questioned.¹⁶

In the meantime, however, all must admit to the convenience and practical utility of this structure in helping the editor to arrange a very difficult and complex body of material. Given this structure we will examine Ziegler's success in presenting the data available.

A. Format

In general, Ziegler's rule is to include in the second apparatus only such readings as are found in the margins of LXX MSS under the conventional symbols for the younger Gk versions, e.g. α' , σ' , θ' , δ' , γ' , ι' , λ' , and in Jer also ω' , while unidentified or anonymous marginal readings are left in the first apparatus (appropriately marked by the superscript ^{mg}). But it is difficult always to be consistent in applying this rule. On occasion Ziegler does assign an anonymous marginal reading to the second apparatus if he feels it can with reasonable

certainly be attributed to some one of the younger translators, cf. the reading of Syh^{mg} at 29:10 ΟΥΚ ΑΝ ΗΦΑΝΙΣΑΝ ΤΑ ΙΚΑΝΑ ΕΑΥΤΟΙΣ which Ziegler attributes to Symmachus and assigns it to the second apparatus, but with the presumed source σ' put in angular brackets to indicate that it is a conjecture on the part of the editor. There are even some marginal readings which, while more difficult to identify as to source, Ziegler nonetheless feels belong in the second rather than the first apparatus, cf. the reading σὺνταξάτο of 86^{mg} at 29:7 which Ziegler believes comes from one of the versions rather than from the LXX and hence includes it in the second apparatus, a question mark in angular brackets indicating his uncertainty as to source. Editorial decisions such as these highlight some of the strains placed on the two-apparatus division,¹⁷ though familiarity with the style and general character of the different versions can make calculated guesses possible.

But Ziegler has chosen to exercise "source criticism" not only only on the anonymous marginal readings but also on many of the readings transmitted under a particular symbol. Sometimes the same (or similar) reading is found in the margin of two different MSS but under different symbols. In such cases Ziegler weighs the evidence and makes a judgment on what he considers the most probable original source. Sometimes he feels a transmitted symbol must be wrong and seeks to identify the correct source. This kind of editorial intervention is predicated on the knowledge that all MS material has been transmitted through fallible scribal hands and that in the process many errors have crept in. As editor Ziegler has assumed the responsibility for weighing the reliability of the MS evidence and for proposing changes where he feels this is demanded.¹⁸ This procedure is in keeping with Göttingen policy that a critical text and apparatus should reflect an editor's considered judgment rather than a mere documentation of the raw MS material. The method will become clear through a comparison of the actual symbols found in the MSS and Ziegler's preferred modifications or annotations. In the tables below all readings come from the margins of the MSS cited.

MSS

<u>29:3</u>	προσωπου οργης θυμου Q ιω' ————— " ————— 86
<u>29:4</u>	α' θ' ·×· τους αλλοφυλους Q ο' ·×· ————— " ————— 86
<u>29:4</u>	α' θ' ·×· και καππαδοκίας Q οι γ' ·×· καππαδοκας 86
<u>29:7</u>	συνεταξατο 86
<u>29:8</u>	α' συνεσις 86
<u>29:9</u>	α' σ' οτι απωλειαν ησαι 86 α' απωλειαν ησαι επηγαγον Syh
<u>29:10</u>	ουκ αν ηφανισαν τα ικανα εαυτοις Syh
<u>29:11</u>	α' απεκαλυψα 86 α' σ' ————— " ————— Syh
<u>29:13</u>	α' θ' ·×· πιοντες Q οι γ' ·×· ————— " ————— 86
<u>29:14</u>	οι γ' εσται βοσορα 86 οι λ' ————— " ————— Syh
<u>29:19</u>	σ' α' απο της δοξης 86* σ' ————— " ————— 86 ^c σ' ————— " ————— Syh
<u>29:20</u>	α' οτι ομοιος μοι και τις υποστησεται μοι 86 α' σ' ομοιος μοι και τις υποστησεται μοι Syh

Ziegler

ιω' προσωπου οργης θυμου Q (anon.) 86
α' θ' ·×· τους αλλοφυλους Q 86 (sub ο')
α' θ' καππαδοκίας Q (και κωππαδ.) 86 (οι γ' καππαδόκα, sic)
<?> συνεταξατο 86
α' (leg. σ') συνεσις 86
α' σ' οτι απωλειαν ησαι επηγαγον 86 (om. επηγαγον) Syh (sub α'; om. οτι)
<σ'> ουκ αν ηφανισαν τα ικανα εαυτοις Syh
α' απεκαλυψα 86 Syh (sub α' σ')
α' <σ'> θ' ·×· πιοντες Q 86 (sub οι γ')
οι γ' εσται βοσορα 86 Syh (sub οι λ')
σ' απο της δοξης 86 (sub σ' α', sed α' del. ^c) Syh
α' σ' οτι τις ομοιος μοι και τις υποστησεται μοι 86 (sub α') Syh (om. οτι τις)

<u>29:22</u>	α' σαλου (or σεισμου) Syh		α' (leg. σ') σαλου (s. σεισμου) Syh
<u>29:23</u>	επι βοσορ 86 α'σ' επι βοσρα Syh		α'σ' επι βοσορ 86 (anon.) Syh (επι βοσρα)

Decisions on the most probable source of a particular reading cannot in the nature of the case be definitive. Yet we can be confident that Ziegler brings to bear on these decisions a balanced and experienced judgement so that the proposed modifications are seldom without plausible reason. By way of illustration we may take the two instances in 29:8 and 29:22 where Ziegler proposes a different source altogether from that found in the MSS. At 29:8 where the LXX has the reading σοφία, 86^{mg} attests the reading συνεισις under the symbol for Aquila. But Ziegler proposes Symmachus instead as the source of this reading. His argument presumably runs something like this: since Aquila's normal rendering of נִחְיָה is in fact σοφία (cf. Reider-Turner, p. 219), it is doubtful that he would have changed the LXX word at this point, especially since σύνεισις is used by Aquila to translate another Heb word altogether, נִיחִיָּה (cf. Reider-Turner, p. 228); on the other hand, since it is characteristic of Symmachus to vary his vocabulary, he is a more likely candidate as the author of this reading. Similarly in the case of the translation of בָּשָׁר at 29:22 which in the LXX is rendered πτεῖσις. According to Syh^{mg}, Aquila translated the Heb at this point with σάλος (or σεισμός depending on which Gk word is thought to underlie the Syriac); Ziegler, however, thinks that this word (i.e. σάλος / σεισμός) must also originate with Symmachus. He probably reasoned that since Aquila regularly rendered the root בָּשָׁר with derivatives of πίπτω (cf. Reider-Turner, pp. 293-294), it seems unlikely that he would have departed from his common practice on this occasion; Symmachus may, however, have sought deliberately to vary his semantic equivalents. In both of the preceding examples we may accept the reasoning and conclusions reached as quite plausible, though absolute certainty is of course impossible. In all of Ziegler's proposed modifications, however, it is important to note that the actual MS evidence is never lost sight of, so that the reader can always

choose whether he prefers Ziegler's explanation or the MS reading, or possibly his own reconstruction.

When we turn from examining the source of a reading to the actual reading itself, we observe that Ziegler proceeds in exactly the same way. Here again he is not content merely to reproduce the MS readings undigested, but cognizant of the cumulative effect of scribal error, he often proposes a different reading or spelling from that found in the MSS; sometimes this even involves addition of words (indicated in the apparatus by the use of angular brackets), and sometimes the deletion of words (indicated by square brackets]). Below is a list of the proposed changes Ziegler makes for Jer 29:

<u>MSS</u>	<u>Ziegler</u>
<u>29:2</u> α' και κυκλωσουσιν 86	και κατακλυσουσιν (κυκλωσουσιν cod.)
<u>29:3</u> α' δρομου ιππων 86 ιω' προσωπου οργης θυμου Q (anon.) 86	<απο φωνης> δρομου ιππων <απο> προσωπου οργης θυμου
<u>29:4</u> α' θ' * και καππαδοκias Q } οι γ' * καππαδοκας 86 }	* καππαδοκias Q (και καππαδ.) 86 (οι γ' καππαδύκας sic)
<u>29:5</u> α' το καταλιμμα... 86	το καταλ<ε>ιμμα...
<u>29:9</u> α' ... εβαθυναν κατοικησαι 86	... εβαθυναν <του> κατοικησαι
<u>29:11</u> α' θ' εταλαιπωρησεν 86 σ' διεφθαρη 86 α' επρονομευθη 86	εταλαιπωρησεν <σπερμα αυτου> διεφθαρη <το σπερμα αυτου> επρονομευθη <σπερμα αυτου>
<u>29:12</u> α' καταλειπε ορφανους... 86	καταλειπε ορφανους <σου>
<u>29:12</u> σ' κατελιπεν ορφανους σου φησι... Ziegler	κατελιπεν ορφανους σου [φησι]

<u>29:12</u>	σ' ... μη αμεριμνη- τῶσαν 86	... [μη] αμεριμνητῶσαν (-νειτ. cod.)
<u>29:14</u>	σ' ἐπ αὐτον ... 86	ἐπ <εμ> αὐτον
<u>29:14</u>	ο' μερει 86	<εση εν> μερει <αυτης>
<u>29:15</u>	α' περιοχη ... 86	<και> περιοχη
<u>29:16</u>	α' σ' *· οτι μικρον 86 α' εν τοις εθνεσιν εξουθενομενον ... 86	*· οτι <ιδου> μικρον εν τοις εθνεσιν εξουθενω- μενον (-νομ. cod.)
<u>29:17</u>	σ' αλαζονια ... 86 S _h	αλαζονεια (-νια 86) ...
<u>29:20</u>	σ' απο της δοξης 86	απο της δοξης <του ιορδανου>
<u>29:20</u>	ω' ... ωχυρωματος 86	... οχυρωματος (ωχ. cod.)
<u>29:20</u>	σ' εξαιφνης δραμειν... S _h	εξαιφνης <γαρ> δραμειν

A number of Ziegler's corrections, it will be observed, are of a mere orthographic nature, e.g. itacism and otacisms. The more substantial changes are proposed corrections in favour of the Heb text. Thus in v. 2 Ziegler feels that Aquila must have used the same verb $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\upsilon\acute{\zeta}\omega$ as is employed in the LXX to translate the Heb verb $\eta\theta\psi$, only that he (Aquila) changed it from the LXX third person singular to the third person plural corresponding to the Heb יִשְׁלַח ; the witness of 86^{mg} which assigns the verb $\kappa\upsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{o}\omega$ to Aquila, Ziegler believes must be a scribal error. In the same way the readings at 29:4 $\kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\pi\pi\alpha\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma$ Q and $\kappa\alpha\pi\pi\alpha\delta\omicron\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ 86 are rejected in favour simply of the genitive $\kappa\alpha\pi\pi\alpha\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma$ without con- /; junction because this alone corresponds with MT גִּבְרָה . The additions and deletions follow the same pattern of approximation to the Heb MT. Implicit in this procedure is the assumption that the Heb text of the younger Gk versions was identical with the MT, a view which is open to question at some points.

But as in the case of Ziegler's proposed source emendations, so here too the MS evidence is always clearly presented alongside the proposed corrections so that one is free to make up one's own mind on the original reading or spelling.

In addition to the careful sifting and documentation of the evidence, Ziegler also provides the second apparatus with many useful cross-references to different passages in Jer and to other biblical books, much as in the first apparatus.

B. Selectivity

In this apparatus it is clear that Ziegler strives for comprehensive rather than selective treatment. A careful check of all the MS evidence for readings under the conventional Hexapla symbols (some in very small and close marginal script, especially in MS 86) for the oracles against the Philistines and Edom has verified the success with which this goal has been achieved, at least for Ch. 29. According to my examination, Ziegler has not missed a single reading relevant for these two oracles. The significance of this achievement can only be appreciated against the background of previous collations of the same material, e.g. those of Spohn, Field, Swete, and Nestle-Dahse.

In the "Notae criticae" to his reconstructed text of Jer, Spohn documented many Hexapla readings from the Syh, as well as some from "Cod. Ies." (i.e. Q). While useful as far as it goes, (especially with regard to the Syh) the treatment is nonetheless only partial.

The standard collection of Hexapla readings since 1875 has been that of F. Field, Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt . . . fragmenta. Yet for the oracles against the Philistines and Edom in Jer, Field's collation is so incomplete and inaccurate as to be considered almost useless. The most important and plentiful of all sources for Hexapla readings in Jer is MS 86, yet this is only infrequently cited by Field; the readings of the new version

under the symbol ω' , for instance, are never cited, along with many other omissions. On the other hand, Field often cites from MS 88, but most inaccurately. This is owing to the fact that Field's collation of 88 was based not on the original MS but on a previous collation by Bernado Stephanopoli of an inaccurate copy of the original codex transcribed in the seventeenth century. Only "Cod. Jes." (=Q) and the Syh seem to be collated with any degree of fidelity, though again incompletely.

Swete in his apparatus included a certain amount of Hexapla material but only from the margin of Q, one of the uncials available for his collation of the Prophets. Swete's collation of Q^{mg} is generally reliable, though not without mistakes, e.g. at 29:3 Swete assigns the reading $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\rho\gamma\eta\varsigma\ \theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon$ in Q^{mg} to Symmachus whereas, in fact, the Q^{mg} reading is anonymous (in 86^{mg} the reading is found under the symbol ω').

The Jer edition of Nestle-Dahse also contained a Hexapla apparatus, but unfortunately little by way of commendation can be said of the collation. Apart from its strange and cumbersome format and the almost unbelievable omission of MS source for a particular Hexapla reading (except for the occasional reference to Q), it does not seem to represent a fresh collation but is rather an extraction of readings from earlier publications. Comparison with Field shows it to be even less complete than that collection; one positive point, however, is that it omits the blatant errors of Field's references to 88.

In short, for the only complete list of Hexapla readings for Jer we must have recourse to Ziegler's second apparatus.

C. Reliability

My investigation has confirmed the fact that in the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, Ziegler's second apparatus is as accurate as it is complete. One possible source of confusion is the way certain readings are inserted in the middle of a

quotation, e.g. 29:1 α' σ' ος εγενηθη λογος κυριου προς ιερειων
τον προφητην επι τους αλλοφυλους (α' προς φυλιστιαιους Syh;
σ' περι των φυλιστιαιων 86) προ του παταξαι φαραω την γαζαν 86.

Unless one is familiar with Ziegler's habit (explained in Isaias, p. 114 as a space-saving device), a question may arise whether the whole clause ος εγενηθη . . . την γαζαν was present in Syh or merely the phrase προς φυλιστιαιους of Aquila, as is in fact the case (cf. the similar type of possible confusion in 29:16 and 29:17). Another minor point is the misleading impression at 29:4 * καππαδοκias Q (και καππαδ.) 86 (οι γ' καππαδοκα, sic) that the readings both in Q and 86 are sub asterisco whereas this is true only for the former. The lemma text at 29:3 should read not ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῶν ἱππῶν αὐτοῦ but simply ὀπλῶν τῶν ἱππῶν αὐτοῦ . On the whole, when measured against previous attempts, Ziegler's apparatus stands out as a bright shining star by which the others fade into obscurity.

III. Critique of Ziegler's Reconstructed Text

As important as the apparatuses are, it is nonetheless the critical text that holds the main interest for us. Having abandoned the expedient of simply reproducing one MS as his text, the editor is faced with a host of decisions regarding what particular reading, spelling, and punctuation to choose. In this section we will evaluate Ziegler's reconstructed text under two main headings: A) Editorial Miscellanea and B) Choice of Readings.

A. Editorial Miscellanea

By the expression "Editorial Miscellanea" we mean all those matters pertaining to the constitution of the critical text except the actual choice of words. Here we shall discuss three such items: 1) Chapter and Verse Divisions, 2) Punctuation and Capitalization, and 3) Orthography and Accentuation. Our interest is in determining and illustrating the methodology employed by Ziegler in each of these areas.

1. Chapter and Verse Divisions

The problem of chapter and verse citation in Jer is complicated by the different arrangement of many passages in the Heb and Gk texts. Where this obtains, Ziegler has always indicated both references, the Heb in parenthesis. Also on p. 147 of the "Einleitung" he has provided two very helpful comparative lists giving the Heb references in terms of the Gk and vice versa. A more serious problem in citing the LXX text of Jer, however, concerns the different numbering systems employed in different editions of the Gk text. A system of chapter divisions was first introduced into the LXX with the Sixtine edition, where in the case of Jer's oracles against the Philistines and Edom these constituted Ch. 29. The Sixtine precedent remained standard up until the publication of Rahlfs' Septuaginta (1935) in which edition Rahlfs frequently broke with previous convention in an effort better to conform the Heb and Gk numbering systems to each other. This policy had a direct bearing on the oracles against the Philistines and Edom in the text of Jer. In the MT the oracle against the Philistines consists of one chapter only, Ch. 47; Rahlfs followed suit in the LXX and made Ch. 29 consist only of the Philistine oracle. This meant that Ch. 30 in Rahlfs' text now commenced with the Edom oracle, followed by the oracles against the Ammonites, Kedar, and Damascus. In the Sixtine tradition Ch. 30 had consisted only of the last three of these.

The verse divisions are no less confusing. These were introduced into the Gk text at least as early as Walton's London Polyglot (1657), generally following the MT. For the OAN section of Jer this again presented special problems. Since in the Heb text the Philistine oracle was numbered vv. 1-7 and the Edom oracle in another chapter was numbered vv. 7-22, there was obviously an overlap at v. 7 when these two oracles were juxtaposed, as happened in the LXX. Thus in the early editions of LXX Jer 29, v. 7 contained both the last verse of the Philistine oracle as well as the first verse of the Edom oracle, a practice which was perpetuated until the first edition of Tischendorf's LXX which numbered the verses of the Edom oracle 8-23 instead of 7-22.

This system was in turn taken over by Swete. In Rahlfs' text, however, the Edom oracle became 30:1-16.

Rahlfs' chapter and verse divisions had indeed much to commend them as an attempt to facilitate cross-references between the Heb and Gk texts. But the Septuaginta-Unternehmen made it a policy decision to follow the traditional chapter and verse divisions, using Swete's latest edition as its model (cf. Duodecim prophetae, p. 133). In the event, therefore, Rahlfs' worthwhile attempt to ease the lot of the reader using both the Heb and Gk texts was aborted and as a result even greater confusion has resulted in view of the wide circulation enjoyed by Rahlfs' text. Hence in citing from the LXX of Jer it is absolutely essential to make quite clear which edition is being used. In the case of the first verse of the Edom oracle this may be referred to as 29:7 (Walton, RH, Field, Bagster), 29:8 (Tischendorf, Swete, Ziegler), or 30:1 (Rahlfs).

In the case of paragraph divisions Ziegler has made limited use of these, though where they occur they conform to Rahlfs' divisions.

2. Punctuation and Capitalization

Punctuation is probably the most effective modern tool that an editor has at his disposal for communicating his interpretation of a given passage. By the deliberate use of commas, periods, semicolons, question marks, and quotation indicators he seeks to secure for a certain passage a particular interpretation at the exclusion of other interpretations. In this area, however, Ziegler's edition does not appear to represent a fresh contribution, being content rather to follow almost exactly Rahlfs' text. An illustration of the difference that punctuation can make in the interpretation of a passage may be gained from a comparison of 29:2b-4a in the editions of Swete and Rahlfs/Ziegler:

SweteRahlfs/Ziegler

καὶ κεκράξονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι,
καὶ ἀλαλάξουσιν ἅπαντες
οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν
(v.3) ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀρμῆς αὐτοῦ,
ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῶν ποδῶν
αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σεισμοῦ
τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτοῦ, ἤχου
τροχῶν αὐτοῦ. οὐκ ἐπέστρεψαν
πατέρες ἐφ' υἱοὺς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ
ἐκλύσεως χειρῶν αὐτῶν.
(v.4) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐπερχομένῃ
τοῦ ἀπολέσαι πάντας τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους.

καὶ κεκράξονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι,
καὶ ἀλαλάξουσιν ἅπαντες
οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν.
(v.3) ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀρμῆς αὐτοῦ,
ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῶν ποδῶν (ἵππων 2i.)
αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σεισμοῦ
τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτοῦ, ἤχου
τροχῶν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐπέστρεψαν
πατέρες ἐφ' υἱοὺς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ
ἐκλύσεως χειρῶν αὐτῶν
(v.4) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ
τοῦ ἀπολέσαι πάντας τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους.

In Swete's text the phrase ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀρμῆς αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ σεισμοῦ τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτοῦ ἤχου τροχῶν αὐτοῦ is cited as the reason for the shouting and wailing of the earth's inhabitants, whereas in Rahlfs' and Ziegler's texts the same phrase, by virtue of different punctuation, becomes the reason why the fathers do not return to their sons. On this occasion I feel Swete's punctuation and interpretation is to be preferred on account of its greater logic and coherent grammar. In Rahlfs' and Ziegler's texts v. 3 becomes much more difficult and cumbersome to translate and understand. Hence Ziegler's expedient of simply adopting Rahlfs' punctuation is not always a felicitous choice.

In the matter of capitalization the three texts of Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler are practically identical, all following the normal practice in Gk of using capitals only for proper names, for the commencement of larger units, and for the introduction of direct speech. However, there is one difference between Swete on the one hand and Rahlfs/Ziegler on the other in that while Swete used the upper case K for the divine name

Κύριος, both Ziegler and Rahlfs use the lower case (though Swete is strangely inconsistent since he used the lower case for θεός).

3. Orthography and Accentuation

As we have already seen, the MS evidence manifests a bewildering variety of orthographic variants. Considering the wide range in time and place from which our MSS come, nothing less was to be expected, but the many conflicting spellings certainly do present an editor with difficult choices regarding which form he should adopt for the critical text. An important discussion of this subject is found in Walter's Text of the Septuagint where on pp. 19 ff. he outlines three options available to the editor of a LXX text: 1) the editor may decide to present his text in its "traditional" spelling, the method chosen by the printed editions of the sixteenth century and their successors; 2) he may seek to reproduce the spelling of a certain standard MS, the "documentary" approach chosen for the Cambridge editions; or 3) he may deliberately attempt to prefer such spellings as can be expected for the translator's period, the "contemporary" approach generally preferred by the Göttingen editors.¹⁹ This third way, that of considering corrupt whatever spelling cannot be justified from the standards of language contemporary with the author, was pioneered for the Göttingen texts by Alfred Rahlfs. In this task he was aided by a vast amount of papyri and inscriptional material discovered in modern times covering both the Ptolemaic period in which the LXX was translated as well as the Imperial and Byzantine periods during which it was frequently copied. By means of this new knowledge Rahlfs sought to eliminate from his edition of the LXX many spellings which he reckoned could not go back to the original translators. Comparison between Ziegler's and Rahlfs' texts show that Ziegler has generally reproduced Rahlfs' orthography, much as he took over Rahlfs' punctuation.²⁰

The rationale underlying this orthographic methodology is the consideration that if in the area of true vocabulary variants it is desirable to recover the earliest possible approximation to what the original translators actually wrote, the same ought to be true, by analogy, of the orthographic variants. But here the situation becomes more complicated. There is namely the disconcerting fact that the original translators/authors

of the LXX, in common with all writers of antiquity, were very inconsistent in their habits of spelling, conventions of this sort being a relatively modern phenomenon. Faced with the problem of heterogeneous spelling even in the autographs, how then should the modern editor proceed? Should he seek to reflect the lack of standardization in the original documents as far as this can be determined, or should he seek to impose some sort of standardization of his own? The editors of the Göttingen series have chosen to follow the latter course. The justification for this approach is that, since by reason of the caprice of scribes in copying MSS the exact spelling at every point of a given word is inaccessible to us anyway, the only alternative left is some form of standardization, the norm taken being the dominant Attic form.

By this reasoning the Göttingen editors make a fundamental distinction between the value of the MS evidence in determining the actual word employed by the translators and the way it is to be spelled. In the former case the MS witness is of primary importance, in the latter case it may be readily disregarded. Thus while the spelling adopted by Rahlfs/Ziegler sometimes follows the earliest MS evidence against the popular spelling in the bulk of the minuscules and printed editions (cf. the spelling

εξολεθρευσει at 29:4 in B* A Q versus εξολεθρευσει elsewhere, including the printed editions--see Thackeray, Grammar, pp. 87-88), more often they leave the spelling of the earliest codices aside in favour of what is considered the more proper form (cf. the preference for the spelling σουμεψηθωσι at 29:21 against that of σουμεψηθωσιν B* or σουμεψηθωσιν B^c 130--Thackeray, Grammar, p. 221). In fact, Walters specifically states that the editor's task is not to decide what the authors actually wrote (for at the time of writing a particular translator may already have been misled by influences such as itacism), but what is the normal spelling which best expresses what was in the author's mind, if not in his ^(Text, p. 21) pen. While it is true that the above explanation of Göttingen policy comes from the pen of Walters rather than from Ziegler or one of the other official editors, it seems clear that at this point Walters is speaking on behalf

of a shared attitude; but in the sharp distinction which the Göttingen school makes between the value of the earliest MS evidence to variants of substance on the one hand and variants of orthography on the other one senses certain tension which has not been entirely resolved or justified.²¹

A special problem has to do with the transcription of proper names, the orthography of which is notoriously erratic in ancient MSS. Here again standardization plays a vital role in the Göttingen editions; in fact, in this area Ziegler sometimes goes beyond Rahlfs, apparently following the lead of Walters. The determinative norm here tends to be the Heb spelling of the MT. Two examples from Jer 29 will illustrate the procedure.

29:9 $\Delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\nu$ / $\Delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$

The Heb name יִרְמְיָהוּ is found twice in Jer: 29:9(49:8) and 32:9(25:23). The MS evidence for LXX Jer is as follows:

29:9 $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu\omega$ 534; $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ 407 538 544; $\delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\mu$ B;
 $\delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\nu$ rel.

32:9 $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ S 407; $\delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha$ 62; $\delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\nu$ rel.

Ziegler's choice whether to print $\Delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\nu$ or $\Delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ is determined by the principle, "Wenn ϵ im Hebr. steht, dann ist ϵ zu schreiben, wie $\text{Α.}\lambda\alpha\mu$, $\text{Α.}\theta\alpha\nu$ ", whereas "Wenn α fehlt, dann muss α stehen", i.e. "für den Übersetzer war das α entscheidend". The spelling $\Delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ had already been proposed by Katz in his thesis, p. 22 (p. 133 of the printed text). In adopting the $\Delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ form Ziegler is able to cite as support MSS 407 538 544 at 29:9 and S 407 at 32:9. In my opinion, however, it is doubtful that the spelling of the MSS cited goes back directly to the original translation. Rather $\Delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ in 407 538 544 is probably a scribal itacistic variant of the archetype spelling $\Delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\nu$. This in itself does not rule out the possibility that the original spelling might still have been with ϵ , but it does suggest that we do not have any

MS evidence reaching directly back to that spelling. In short, the $\Delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ spelling is not strictly based on MS evidence but on other text-critical principles, in this case, conformity to the MT. But how can we be sure that for the translator "war das "entscheidend"? There seems no way of proving this. There is always the possibility that other influences may have been at work on the translator, such as euphony, the existence of an already Hellenised form of the name, not to mention the possibility of a different spelling in the translator's Vorlage. Consequently, I do not find it convincing to ignore the almost consistent Gk spelling $\Delta\alpha\delta\alpha\nu$ of the MSS here. It seems a much safer policy to print the standard MS form of the name (as did Rahlfs) rather than to adopt a small minority reading on the basis of unproved translation procedure. In his review of the Göttingen text of Ezekiel, (RB 59(1952),609) Barthélemy called attention to Ziegler's over-reliance on the MT as a norm in the restoration of proper names. On the basis of this criticism Ziegler undertook to re-study the proper names in Jer (cf. Beiträge, p. 59). The case of $\Delta\alpha\delta\alpha\nu$ / $\Delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu$ in 29:9 is an example where Barthélemy's advice could have been profitably applied. It is interesting to note that in his edition of Genesis, Wevers has retained the spelling $\Delta\alpha\delta\alpha\nu$ (25:3).

29:20 $A.\theta\alpha\mu$ / $A.\theta\alpha\nu$

The Heb word יָקִיָּן is found in the OT both as an adjective with the meaning "strong", "enduring", and as a proper name for person and place. In Jer 49:19 its function is that of an adjective describing the noun ("a strong sheepfold" RSV). In the LXX translation of the passage, however, it was taken as a proper name. The question is, How should it be spelled? Most witnesses have the spelling $A.\theta\alpha\mu$ (though curiously the Hexaplaric and Catena texts have $\alpha.\mu\alpha\theta$). Ziegler, nevertheless, prefers the spelling $A.\theta\alpha\nu$, not at all attested for 29:20 though found in MSS 46 86 233 at 27:44. How valid is this proposal?

There is no doubt that there was frequent interchange of ν and μ in the transmission of the proper name under consideration (as well as in other names, cf. 29:8 $\Delta\alpha.\delta\alpha\nu$] $\delta\alpha.\delta\alpha\mu$ B in previous example). For illustration we may cite the most important witnesses to the variants attested for this name in 1 Chr, which are as follows:

2:6	B	AN
2:8	B	AN
6:42(27)	c_2	BAN
6:44(29)	B	AN
15:17	S	BAN
15:19	im	BSAN

In the edition of Rahlfs the name is spelled $A.\theta\alpha\nu$ on each of its occurrences. But I do not think that this levelling of the MS evidence in favour of the Heb spelling is felicitous. L.C. Allen has recently shown that the A group in Chr (of which N is also a member) is heavily recensional (i.e. Hexaplaric) while the B group (of which c_2 and S are members) represents the best witness to the Old Greek, much as in Jer (The Greek Chronicles, I, 1974). The consistent spelling $A.\theta\alpha\nu$ in the A group, therefore, is highly suspect as an approximation to MT in 1 Chr. Where it occurs, the same may be true for Jer, hence I doubt that standardization on the basis of the MT is defensible. If there is to be any standardization in the spelling of the word under consideration, it should be on the basis of the most common and ^{best} attested Gk form, i.e. $A.\theta\alpha\mu$ (the same spelling is also employed by Eusebius, Onomastica, GCS, p. 38).

Closely related to orthography is the matter of accentuation. In this area Ziegler again follows Rahlfs exactly, except for a few words which he accents differently on the recommendation of Katz (Walters) (Ieremias, p. 110). The policy of accenting only those proper names (or other transliterations) with a Gk ending while leaving "barbarous" words unaccented is also taken over directly from Rahlfs, a practice which in turn appears to go back

to Lagarde's edition of Pars Prior (1883). In contrast to this procedure, Swete accented all Gk names, and this policy has now been adopted for the latest editions of the Göttingen series (cf. Wevers, Genesis, p. 62).

Summarizing our observations on the "Editorial Miscellanea" of Ziegler's edition of Jer we conclude that in these matters the text is heavily dependent on previous editions. In the case of chapter and verse divisions it follows the edition of Swete over against Rahlfs, but in the matter of punctuation and orthography the reverse is true. In these three areas, therefore, apart from a few exceptions,²² the text should not be considered a fresh advance but as appropriating work previously done.²³

B. Choice of Readings

Ultimately the most important decisions that face an editor of a critical text have to do with his actual choice of readings to be adopted in the text itself. In these decisions he is guided by his overall aim and by the application of specific text-critical principles.

On the subject of the overall aim of the Göttingen enterprise it is usually said that its ultimate purpose is the reconstruction of the LXX "in seiner Ältesten erreichbaren Gestalt",²⁴ a deliberately guarded formulation that leaves open the question to what extent the "Ältesten erreichbaren Gestalt" also represents the "original" or "true" LXX. In 1953 Ziegler wrote, "Richtig ist, dass man sich niemals einbilden darf, den "Urtext" der Septuaginta herstellen zu können" (Biblica 34(1953), 435), yet a reading of his supplementary monograph to the critical edition of Jer, Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta, makes clear that the discussion is carried on at the level of what the original translator(s) may or may not have written. For all practical purposes, therefore, the ideal remains to reach back to the original text, "the text which the translators brought into being" (H.M. Orlinsky, "Current Progress and Problems", p. 144). Ziegler

does not presume that this goal has everywhere been perfectly achieved, but there can be little doubt that it is this ideal which inspires his effort.

With regard to the formulation of specific text-critical principles whereby this goal may be achieved, it was Paul de Lagarde who laid the foundations for these in Göttingen. Lagarde insisted that the standard methods employed in the editing of classical texts should also be applied to the LXX with certain additional provisions suited to the translation status of most of its books.²⁵ According to classical methodology there are two principal steps in the restoration of an ancient text, the recensio and the emendatio (or examinatio in the terminology preferred by Maas--Textual Criticism, 1958, p. 1), the former being the selection of the most trustworthy witnesses on which a text is to be based, the second being the task of deciding which of the competing readings best represents the original. Decisions of the latter kind are influenced by external considerations such as the date and group relationship of the witnesses and by internal factors such as transcriptional probability (having to do with a knowledge of scribal habits and mistakes) and intrinsic probability (having to do with a knowledge of the author's style and vocabulary). In cases where none of the transmitted readings can be accepted as representing the original, a third step, that of divinatio or conjecture may be resorted to.

All of the above criteria have been employed by Ziegler in his reconstruction of the main text. We will evaluate the success of his enterprise according to the following outline: 1) Choice of B Group Readings, 2) Choice of Other MS Readings, and 3) Choice of Conjectural Emendations.

1. Choice of B Group Readings

The analysis of the available MS evidence for Jer has revealed that the generally most reliable witness to the earliest text of this book is the B group, consisting at its fullest of

B-S(106')-130-239-538. In keeping with this data, Ziegler's stated policy is to prefer a reading of the B group unless it can be shown in some way to be secondary or corrupt (Ieremias, p. 125). In Jer 29 we can document several instances where this policy has been carried through. We note first those places where Ziegler has preferred a narrowly transmitted B group reading over against some other widely distributed readings:

- 29:3 ἐφ' B-S-130] ἐπὶ rel.
- 29:10 ὥς B-S] ὡςπερ A-106' C-613 ; ὡς rel.
- 29:13 ἀθωωθῆς B-S-106'-538] ὅτι πινούσα πηγὴ L Th^t ;
+ ὅτι πινῶν (variants: πινῶν, πινούσα, πινόντι) πίσει rel. = MT = Rahlfs
- 29:17 ὕψωσεν B-S-410-538] -σας C 106 = MT ;
ἐν ὑψώσεως (-σεως A 26 239 86^m) rel.
- 29:21 ἐπ' αὐτήν B-S*-106'-130-538] ἐπ' αὐτὴν A ;
ἐπ' αὐτῆς S^c 26 ; ἐπ' αὐτοὺς rel. = MT
- 29:22 ἐφοβήθη B-S-538] ἐσ(ε)ισθῆ rel. = Rahlfs

It is interesting to observe that on two occasions above Ziegler has followed the B group even where Rahlfs opted for the majority text reading.

Sometimes the MS evidence splits right down the middle; here too we can show that Ziegler frequently sides with the reading supported by the B group:

- 29:2 πάντες B-S-130-410-538 Q-544 O C^{-49 90 764}] πάντες rel.
- 29:9 βαθύνατε B-S-130 V-26-46-534-544 O L^{-76 51 449}]
+ ἐαυτοῖς (-τοὺς 87 538 Th^t ; ἐν αὐτοῖς 106) A-106'
Q-86-233-239-538-613 36-51-449 C

- 29:9 ἐπ' αὐτόν 2° B-106-130 Q-46-233-613 36 C-9' 490] ἐπ αὐτήν S 26 410; ἐπ αὐτῷ 91-490; om. ἐπ A V-86'-239-534-544 O L⁻³⁶-538 = MT
- 29:10 ἡλθον B-S-106'-538 Q^c C-613] + σοι rel. = MT
- 29:10 οἱ B-S-106'-239-538 Q^c-26-233-613 88 L C] om. A Q^x-V-46-86'-130-534-544 S_{yh} = MT
- 29:13 οἱς B-S-538 A-106' C] pr. ιδου rel. = MT
- 29:14 κατάρασιν B-130-410 Q-26-86'-233-534] καταραν S-239 A-106 V-538-544 C-613; επικαταρασιν L Th^t; επικαταραν 88; καταπαυσιν 46
- 29:14 εἰς αἰῶνα B-S-106-130-239 V-26-46-86'-534-544] εἰς αἰῶνας O 51-449; εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα A-410 Q-233-538-613 C; εἰς αἰῶνος L^{-51 407 449}
- 29:18 συριεῖ B-S-130-538 A-106'] εκοτησεται (pr. συριεῖ C) και συριεῖ ἐπὶ (ἐν 87^{ext}) παση τη πληγῇ (πασαν την πληγην Q-239-613) αὐτης rel. = MT
- 29:19 ὥσπερ B-S-130-239-538 A-106' Q-613 C] ως V-26-46-86'-233-534-544 O L
- 29:21 συμψησθῶσι(ν) B-130-239 V-26-86'-233-534 S_{yh} L^{-51 51' 62 311 407 449} C-490] συμψηφισθωσι(ν) A-106 Q-46-544-613 88 51-51'-62-311-407-449-538 490; συνωσιν S 410
- 29:22 ὅτι B-S-130-239-538 A-106' 36 C-613] om. rel. = MT
- 29:22 καὶ B-S-239-538 A-106' C-613] om. rel. = MT

2. Choice of Other MS reading

While it is true that Ziegler has laid the B group as his foundational text, on several occasions he has been led to reject the B group in favour of another MS reading. Below we will list and evaluate the relevant instances for Jer 29.

29:4 ἐπερχομένη B / ἔρχομένη rel.

The reading ἐπερχομένη in the phrase ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐπερχομένη (נבֿה דִּי־הִלֵּעַ) is found only in Codex Vaticanus so that strictly speaking it is not a B group reading. Such unique readings in an ancient codex--even when that codex happens to be Vaticanus--stand little chance of going back to the original, and the reading has rightly been rejected by Ziegler. The similar Heb phrase דִּי־נבֿה דִּי־הִלֵּעַ is uniformly translated ἡμέρᾳ ἔρχονται (13x) in all the witnesses to LXX Jer. The development in later Gk to prefer compound in place of simple forms of the verb may account for the scribal change here.

29:10 κατάλειμμα B-S-106'-239 26-534-613 C (-ατα A Q-V*)
καλαμῆματα O L

The problem in this verse concerns the translation of the word נִלְבָּיִץ in the phrase נִלְבָּיִץ יַגִּשׁוּ נֶלְ which in the majority of the Gk tradition is rendered οἱ οὐ καταλείψουσὶ σοὶ κατάλειμμα (-ατα). Somewhat surprisingly Ziegler has opted for the variant καλαμῆματα attested by the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions only. In defense of this choice Ziegler appeals to the translation of לָבַיִץ in Jer 6:9 by καταμᾶσθαι and explains the form κατάλειμμα (-ατα) as conscious or subconscious scribal assimilation to the immediately preceding Gk verb καταλείψουσὶ ^(Beiträge, p. 48) [^]. But in the process Ziegler has to by-pass the weighty MS evidence of the majority Gk tradition and adopt a reading from two related groups of known recensional character. A priori it is not impossible that an original reading should have been preserved in the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions only while corrupted in

the rest of the MSS. But I do not find the internal considerations cited (the single translation equivalent at 6:9 and the explanation of transcriptional assimilation in *κατάλειμμα* (-ατα) sufficiently convincing to set aside the strong external MS evidence of the B group and majority Gk tradition. The noun *καλάμημα* is not attested in Gk literature outside its occurrence here in O/L and in Theodotion's translation of the parallel passage in Ob 5 (where LXX has the standard translation equivalence *ἐπιφυλλίδες* / *נִי־לֵי־וֹ*). If Theodotion used the word *καλαμῆματα* for *נִי־לֵי־וֹ* in Ob 5 the likelihood is that he did the same in the Edom oracle of Jer and I suspect that this is the source of the O/L reading at 29:10. Since there is no firm translation pattern in the rest of the LXX with regard to the use of *κατάλειμμα* (-ατα) there appears to be no reason why it could not have been used here to render *נִי־לֵי־וֹ*.²⁶ Rahlfs printed *καταλείμματα* with A Q-V+ but this may be a Gk refinement in those groups so that I should prefer that the critical text stayed with the B group reading *κατάλειμμα*.

29:11 γείτονός μου B-S / καὶ γείτονος αὐτοῦ

As a translation of the Heb phrase *וְיָדוּשׁוּ וְיִתְנִיחוּ יָדָם תַּחַת* the B-S text has *ἔλυντο διὰ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, γείτονός μου* whereas Ziegler's text reads *ἔλυντο ἐπὶ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ γείτονος αὐτοῦ*. For discussion of the conjectural emendation *ἐπὶ χεῖρα* see below pp.167-169. The B-S omission of the conjunction *καί* is additionally supported by 130 Co Aeth while the B-S reading *μου* (as opposed to *αὐτοῦ*) finds further support in 410 Bo Aeth Arab. The phrase *καὶ γείτονος αὐτοῦ* in preference to the B-S reading *γείτονός μου* was adopted initially in Rahlfs' text and has apparently been taken over from there by Ziegler. Is this critical choice justified?

While it is true that the reading *καὶ γείτονος αὐτοῦ* corresponds to the MT *וְיָדוּשׁוּ* and appears to make better sense in the Gk,²⁷ one wonders whether this is sufficient grounds for rejecting the witness of B-S. Might it not be that the reading

καὶ γείτονος αὐτοῦ is a Gk approximation in favour of the Heb, perhaps going back to the pre-Hexaplaric revision of the Q group? This possibility cannot be ruled out. Again the editor is faced with the tension between internal and external considerations, but lacking decisive evidence in favour of the later majority text reading my preference would be to print the earliest reading at our disposal-- γείτονό μου of B-S-- and let the apparatus speak for any alternative possibilities.

29:12 καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι B-S-239-538 A-106' C-613
 (καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτοῦ διασώσω L) / om. Q-V+ O

Where the MT reads הִתְנַחֵם the majority Gk text has ἵνα ζήσῃται (-εται) καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι. It seems clear that we are dealing here with a double reading in the Gk. Ziegler has followed the Q and O groups in omitting καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι from his critical text and cites three additional instances from the latter half of Jer where the double reading is attested by B-S A (C) while one half is missing in Q-V O L (C) (Beiträge, p. 102). What cannot be determined with certainty is whether the Q revision (followed by O) eliminated an existing double reading or whether the double reading in B-S A (L) C crept in after the Q revision. If the Q revision eliminated one half of an existing double reading it is surprising that it would have suppressed the reading closest to the MT הִתְנַחֵם. At any rate, Ziegler is justified in omitting καὶ ἐγὼ ζήσομαι with Q-V+ O since this has all the marks of a secondary addition to harmonize with the Heb.

29:13 εἶπεν B-S-538 / λέγει rel.

This is a particularly thorny problem since the choice between εἶπεν and λέγει in the translation of the messenger formula הָאִישׁ אֲמַר כֵּן is related to the translator/reviser problem to be discussed in the next chapter. At this point it will be sufficient to note that while the common translation of the said messenger formula in the first half of the

book, up to and including 29:8, is $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, the corresponding rendition in the second half commencing with 30:1 is $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. In between at 29:13 is the hybrid form $\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ in B-S-538. Here again the editor is faced with a clear choice between the witness of the earliest external evidence versus the internal evidence of translation pattern. Ziegler on this occasion has opted for the latter alternative.²⁸

29:19 $\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$ B-S (-ση Q-130-239-538-613) / $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$
 V 26 62 91 (-ση 88 L⁻⁶² C⁻⁹¹) / $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta$ A

In the choice between the verbs $\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ Ziegler has preferred the former which is attested by B-S-130-239-538 Q-613. But in the choice between the future -σει (B-S) and aorist subjunctive -ση (Q-130-239-538-613) Ziegler prefers the latter since the verb in question follows the emphatic $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\mu\eta$. The interchange between -ει and -η is probably nothing more than an orthographic variant so that Ziegler is justified in following the conventional rule of Gk grammar in preferring the aorist subjunctive.

Concluding Remarks

As one reads Ziegler's critical text, not only in Jer 29 but throughout, and compares it with the apparatus one is frequently aware of the opposing forces which claim the editor's loyalty: on the one hand there is the claim of the external evidence of the generally best MS group, while on the other hand there are the claims of internal considerations such as translation pattern and suitability to context. To resolve the tension created by these (sometimes) opposing forces is no easy task and Ziegler in effect treads a path of compromise between them, sometimes preferring one, sometimes the other in accordance with what he considers the relative merits of each new case. In adopting this policy Ziegler has avoided the polar positions of NT textual criticism represented on the one hand by Westcott

and Hort's reliance on the criterion of the best MS and on the other hand Professor Kilpatrick's advocacy of the criterion of internal fitness, an approach which has been labeled "rational" or "rigorous eclecticism".²⁹ If we had to describe Ziegler's text-critical posture in current NT terminology, we might call it a "modified rational eclecticism", by which we mean that his approach is decidedly eclectic in that it deliberately seeks to choose the most appropriate reading from a host of competing witnesses, but his choices are frequently tempered by a greater allegiance to the "best MS" tradition than is characteristic among the proponents of "rigorous eclecticism". While we have great confidence in Ziegler's ability and sobriety of judgement, both the method chosen and the actual textual decisions made nevertheless invite constant reappraisal.³⁰ In one of his earlier volumes Ziegler had himself invited such reappraisal. For my part I should like to see an even greater--but not exclusive--reliance on the B group readings for the reconstruction of the archetype text than that reflected in Ziegler's edition. While many of Ziegler's proposed improvements on the B group readings are plausible enough, few are decisively convincing, and in such cases we do better to print the reading of the generally best attested form of the pre-Hexaplaric text, namely the B group.

3. Choice of Conjectural Emendations

In the field of classical studies, the recensio and examinatio have often led to divinatio--the adoption of a conjectured reading. In NT textual criticism, by contrast, modern editions of the text rarely, if ever, incorporate a conjectured reading into the text, though a few may be included in the apparatus.³¹ The reason for this difference in approach between classical and NT studies is generally attributed to the fact that whereas most of the classics are preserved only in relatively few and late MSS, the text of the NT is attested in a superabundance of MSS, many of them quite early, so that the need for conjectural emendation does not arise in the latter in the same way as in the classics.³²

What should be the policy on the adoption of conjectural emendations in a critical text of the LXX, considering that the LXX stands somewhere between the classics and the NT both with regard to the wealth and date of the material available? In answer to this question, LXX text critical scholarship offers no consensus. Some have contended that a conjectural emendation should never be adopted into the body of a critical text (cf. H.S. Gehman, VT 3 (1953), 400); Ziegler, however, holds that this rule is too strict, though he agrees that only such emendations should be admitted into the text as have the highest degree of probability, while most should be confined to the apparatus (Beiträge, p. 8; Ieremias, pp. 128-129). In Jer 29 Ziegler has on four occasions (five if we count the conjectured spelling Α.Θ.ν discussed above) admitted into his text a conjectured reading which he feels better represents the original than any preserved MS reading. In the following pages I have sought thoroughly to evaluate the Beweiskraft of these emendations. In the process I have come to the negative conclusion that they do not convince sufficiently to be retained in the body of the text. Somewhat reluctantly, I have also come to the conclusion that in the editing of LXX--as in the case of current NT practice--it is better, except in unusual cases, to print only attested readings. Conjectured readings which attempt to go behind the archetype should be confined to the apparatus.

The four emendations to be discussed are ἰππων in 29(47):3, τὸ πρόσωπον in 29:9(49:8), ἡπίχειρον in 29:11(49:10), and ἐν θαλάσῃ σουφ in 29:22(49:21). These and other emendations are briefly commented upon by Ziegler in Ch. 1, "Konjekturen und umstrittene Textlesarten in der Ier.-LXX", Beiträge, pp. 17-58 ("Konjekturen", pp. 18-37). In the discussion below, each conjectural emendation is introduced by an extract of text from Ziegler's edition containing the conjectured word or phrase, accompanied by an apparatus giving the relevant MS readings.

29(47):3 ἰππων

ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀρμῆς αὐτοῦ
ἀπὸ τῶν ὀπλῶν τῶν ἰππων αὐτοῦ

שׁוֹמֵר קוֹל
וְרִבְיָא פְּרִסְוֹת

ἰππων] δυνατων O L^{-51 401 449}; δυναμεων 407; πολλων 130 538;
ποδων rel.

The majority text of 29:3 contains the reading ποδῶν αὐτοῦ difficult to reconcile with the MT וְרִבְיָא . Ziegler, following Schleusner, II, p. 845 (approved by Coste, p. 29 (not p. 23 as in Ziegler, Beiträge, p. 27) and Katz, TLZ 61 (1936), 280), has adopted the conjectural emendation ἰππων αὐτοῦ as representing the original Gk. But the suggestion is beset with a number of difficulties. The following points apply:

1. Schleusner originally proposed the emendation with the remark, "Fortasse scribendum est ἰππος, quam notionem רִבְיָא haud raro habet" ποῦς . But on that basis the emended reading also stands condemned, for nowhere else in the LXX nor in the Minor Gk Versions is רִבְיָא ever rendered by ἰππος, either. In such a case, the transmitted unique rendition must a priori be preferred to the conjectured unique rendition.

2. Apart from 1 Sam 21:8 רִבְיָא is found only in poetry, and although its root meaning is well established as "strong" or "mighty", its specific meaning in any given instance can be determined only from the context.³³ The renditions of רִבְיָא in the LXX fall into three groups: a) those instances where the translators simply employed the base meaning of רִבְיָא apparently without much consideration of context,³⁴ e.g., δυνάστης, Gen 49:24, δυνάτορ, Jud 5:22 (A text), ἰσχύς, Is 10:13, 49:26, ἰσχυρόρ, Jud 5:22 (B text), Lam 1:15, ἰσχύω Is 1:24; b) those instances where context played the primary role in the interpretation of רִבְיָא, e.g., θεός, Ps. 131(132):2,5, Is 60:16, ἄγγελος, Ps 77(78):25, τωῶρος³⁵ Ps 21(22):13, 49(50):13, 67(68):31, Is 34:7, Jer 27(50):11,

ἰππασία³⁶ Jer 8:16, μόσχος³⁷ Jer 26(46):15; c) other instances where the renditions are truly problematic, e.g., νέμω 1 Re 21:7(8), ἀσύνετος Ps 75(76):6, ἀδύνατος Job 24:22, 34:20, ἀπόλλυμι Is 46:12.³⁸ In the light of the great variety of translation equivalents, there is no guarantee what the translation might have been in any given instance; certainly it would be presumptuous without further evidence to assume that at 29(47):3 the translator hit it right according to our modern understanding of the context.

3. The translation of רִבִּי in 29(47):3 by ἰππος is made less certain still by the appearance of other Heb/Gk discrepancies in the same verse; analysis of the Gk suggests that the translator found the entire phrase in which רִבִּי appears difficult to handle. For one thing, the word ὄρμη (probably in the sense "assault" or "attack") is a guess at the meaning of the Heb hapax legomenon טַשַּׁשׁ*, in the English versions rendered "stamping" in conformity with the understanding of the entire passage, "the stamping of the hoofs of his stallions" (RSV). Then, assuming identical Heb Vorlage to MT, there was the failure to connect טַשַּׁשׁ with פָּרָסוֹת, and this apparently led the translator to see in the phrase חֲקוֹל טַשַּׁשׁ פָּרָסוֹת two parallel phrases rather than one continuous phrase. This in turn demanded further modifications: the possessive ὄρμη; αὐτοῦ does not correspond to the construct טַשַּׁשׁ, nor is the second ἀπό represented in the Heb.

Since in the Gk reading of the phrase, רִבִּי is parallel to the hapax טַשַּׁשׁ*, it is understandable that the translator would have had difficulty making sense of רִבִּי, too. Nor is there anything in the entire oracle preceding רִבִּי which would have prepared him for any easy solution to the problem or demanded a translation such as ἰππος. It is true that the verse goes on to speak about "chariots" (ἀρμάτα / רֶכָבֹת) and "wheels" (τροχοί / ἄλλοι ἄλλοι), but this is still not of the order of parallelism in which, for instance, the meaning ταῦρος was obtained in other

contexts where $\gamma \beta \lambda$ is mentioned in conjunction with other animals. Even the correct equivalence $\delta\pi\lambda\omicron$ / $\alpha\iota\delta\gamma\beta$ in our verse does not demand that the translator followed this word with $\iota\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma$. After all, although the phrase $\delta\pi\lambda\omega\nu$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\pi\omicron\delta\omega\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, "the hoofs of his feet", is rather redundant, perhaps even technically wrong, it is not so absurd as to be thought entirely impossible.

4. The proposed emendation assumes that an original $\iota\pi\pi\omega\nu$ was later corrupted to $\pi\omicron\Delta\omega\nu$. Although there is some orthographic resemblance between them, both are simple and common words, and it is not easy to see (as admitted by Ziegler, Beiträge, p. 27) how the one would be confused with the other. Transcriptional probability, therefore, is not in favour of the reading $\iota\pi\pi\omega\nu$ either. Rudolph (ZAW, 7 (1930), 277) has suggested that the original Gk reading was $\pi\omicron\Lambda\Lambda\omega\nu$ (attested by 130 538 Compl) instead of $\pi\omicron\Delta\omega\nu$, the Δ and Λ being easily interchanged. On this reading, the phrase could be translated "the hoofs of his multitudes". However, one suspects the direction of corruption was from $\Delta \rightarrow \Lambda$ rather than vice versa.

5. Ziegler comments (Beiträge, p. 28), "Trotz aller Schwierigkeiten steht fest, dass $\pi\omicron\delta\omega\nu$ verderbt ist. Wenn man ändert, dann hat $\iota\pi\pi\omega\nu$ den Vorzug". But if the case is as uncertain as Ziegler admits and as the above review has demonstrated, is it not preferable to let the best attested MS reading stand in the text and assign the conjecture to the apparatus? For it is clear that the conjectured reading raises as many problems as the MS reading, and, as B. Metzger has pointed out, "an emendation that introduces fresh difficulties stands self-condemned".³⁹ Metzger's further remarks are also apropos: "The conjecture does not rise from a certain level of probability ('a happy guess') to the level of certainty, or approximate certainty, unless its fitness is exact and perfect. The only criterion of a successful conjecture is that it shall approve itself as inevitable. Lacking inevitability, it remains doubtful".⁴⁰

Since nothing is gained by replacing one doubtful reading with another, the best counsel is to stay with the transmitted reading.

29:9(49:8) τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν

ἔχετο σοφία αὐτῶν

םתחכמה נהרע

ἡπατήθη τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν

והפנה פניו

τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν] τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν S*; ο (ο sub * 88; om. ο S^c 130 410) τοπος αὐτῶν rel.

Regarding the divergent readings ἡπατήθη ὁ τόπος, αὐτῶν ("their place has been deceived") in most LXX MSS and וְהִפְנֶה פָּנָיו ("flee, turn back"), Spohn (p. 377) curtly declares, "Nullo modo Graeca hebraicis respondent". The complete lack of correspondence between the two versions has given rise to a variety of suggestions for emending the texts. Spohn himself proposed ἡπατήθη (from πατέω) ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν, but considered this phrase an "explicatio verborum sequentium", the LXX having neglected to translate וְהִפְנֶה פָּנָיו, either deliberately or because the phrase was already missing in its Heb Vorlage. Hitzig (p. 366) retained Spohn's ἡπατήθη but retroverted the phrase וְהִפְנֶה פָּנָיו. Schwally (p. 201, n. 1) carried the speculation further by taking וְהִפְנֶה פָּנָיו as a doublet unrepresented in the Gk, with ἡπατήθη ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν corresponding to םתחכמה נהרע (החכמה Gies. p. 242), which in turn was taken as a variant of MT נהרע. Duhm (p. 354) poked fun at such fanciful conjecture ("Die Reversion ist also vorsichtig zu behandeln, sonst macht sie Kunststückchen wie ein Kasperle") and preferred to stay as close as possible to the MT; in his view ἡπατήθη ... αὐτῶν translated וְהִפְנֶה פָּנָיו (post-biblical use of פָּנָיו).

The reading which we find in Ziegler's text, ἡπατήθη τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν, derives from a suggestion made by Wutz (p. 34) and endorsed by Katz in correspondence with Ziegler. Wutz's theory is that the reading of S* (Wutz incorrectly writes A*), namely τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν, preserves the remnant of an

original τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτόν (Ziegler, Beiträge, p. 28, assumes that Wutz meant to write αὐτῶν). This Gk phrase may then have been derived from the Heb וְהָיָה (cf. Duhm above). While at first blush the conjecture appears to have much to commend it, further investigation reveals a number of unanswered problems.

1. There is first the danger of relying too much on S*.⁴¹ While it is true that S is a member of the B group and hence frequently a witness to the earliest text, it is also true that this MS--particularly the portion in which Jer occurs--contains a bewildering variety of unique variants and scribal errors, as a glance at Swete's apparatus will quickly show. Hence it is just as easy to explain the nonsense phrase τὸ πρὸς αὐτόν as a corruption of ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν (ΟΤΟΠΟCΑΥΤΩΝ → ΤΟΠΡΟCΑΥΤΩΝ) as it is to regard it as the remnant of an original τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν .

2. The above view is reinforced by the consideration that if τὸ πρὸς αὐτόν is taken as a corruption of τὸ πρόσωπον (ΤΟΠΡΟCΩΠΟΝ→ΤΟΠΡΟCΑΥΤΟΝ) this still leaves out of account the word αὐτῶν . Either it has to be assumed that αὐτῶν dropped out of S* or else that the fragment -ωπον of πρόσωπον dropped out and the original αὐτῶν was changed to αὐτόν in conformity with the required case for the preposition πρὸς . Either way, it is essential to see that the S* reading does not lead automatically to the emended reading.

3. A further factor to take into account is the problem of explaining why or how the reasonable reading ἡ πατήθη τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν would have been changed to the more difficult ἡ πατήθη ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν . From an inner-Gk point of view one would have to favour the transmitted reading on the principle lectio difficilior potior.

4. The Gk equivalence of ןןפן^{42} is only half the problem. No attempt has been made to explain how $\eta\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\theta\eta$ is to be deduced from ןן , a point recognized by Ziegler ("Allerdings ist die Wiedergabe des Verbuns auch nicht durchsichtig"), though Wutz and Duham had proposed ןןן (the ן corresponding to the ן of ןןפן). But it is highly unlikely that we are to postulate another Vorlage here. The juxtaposition of ןן and ןןפן is found three times elsewhere in the OAN section of Jer (MT 46:5,21, 49:24). Streane (p. 281) speculated that the translator read ןן but saw in it the root ןפן perhaps as reasonable a theory as any. Interestingly enough, however, ןן was correctly rendered by $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ a few lines further down, 30:8(49:30).

Thus we have to admit that what we have here is a real textual conundrum in which we are thrown back to Spohn's original comment, "Nullo modo Graeca hebraicis respondent". Ziegler attempts to emend half of the problem passage by changing it in favour of a particular reading of the Heb that he thinks the Gk translator had in view. The attempt is not without its merits, but the other problems will not go away. Since we must plead ignorance on how $\eta\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\theta\eta$ relates to ןן , it seems best to do the same with $\acute{\omicron}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\nu$ / ןןפן and print instead the transmitted reading. The conjecture belongs in the apparatus.

29:11(49:10) ἐπίχειρα

$\acute{\omega}\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ ἐπίχειρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ

ן'ןןן ןפןפן פפן

ἐπίχειρα] δία χειρα (-ρος 407 534 Tht (-pas')) MSS; pr. (* O-Q^m) σπέρμα (το σπ. Q^m L^{si} 311) αὐτοῦ O-Q^m L Arm Tht

As may be observed, no part of the Gk phrase corresponds exactly to the MT (פפן is sing. where $\acute{\omega}\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ is pl.; the Gk has no conjunction corresponding to ן in ן'ןןן), but the root problem with the LXX translation of this phrase was the misreading of MT ןפןפן as deriving from פןפן ("arm")

instead of זרע ("seed"). In conformity with Origen's principle of not wanting to eliminate anything from the LXX, he "corrected" the Gk by placing $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ before his LXX reading, thus resulting in a lectio duplex in the Hexaplaric recension.

But in addition to the Gk/Heb problem, Ziegler thinks it likely that we also have here an inner-Gk corruption. While nearly all the MSS read $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}\ \chi\epsilon\grave{\iota}\rho\alpha$ (407 534. Tht modify the case to the more natural $\chi\epsilon\grave{\iota}\rho\omicron\varsigma$), Ziegler prints $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$ as the original LXX. The suggestion comes from Rudolph (ZAW 7 (1930), 278) whose reconstruction is based on the observation that "das blosse $\chi\epsilon\grave{\iota}\rho$ ist nirgends in LXX Übersetzung von זרע " while the word זרעו is translated by $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\nu$ in 31(48):25 and 34:4(27:5). As before, the conjecture appears attractive, but the following considerations must be weighed against its adoption in the critical text:

1. As already pointed out (p. 162), a unique LXX translation is in itself not sufficient ground for emendation. After all, the translation of זרעו by $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$ in Ps 82:8 (83:9) is also a unique and odd rendition.

2. It should be noted that there is a significant difference in number between the proposed $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$ of 29:11 and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\nu$ in 31:25 and 34:4. The singular form $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\nu$ with meaning "arm" is not attested in Gk literature outside Jer 31:25 and 34:4, while the plural form is well attested with the meaning "wages", "reward", or in a bad sense "punishment". If the LXX translator (or reviser, see below p. 196) employed the singular form in 31:25 and 34:4, why would he use the plural form in 29:11 with the common meaning "wages"/"reward", especially since there is nothing in the Heb which demands the plural? To do so would have been both inconsistent on his part and misleading, since the plural presumably already had an established meaning.

3. The emendation fails to explain how an original ἐπί was changed to διὰ. Did it arise as a result of scribal error (there is no orthographical similarity between them) or deliberate change (for what reason)?

4. Although the genitive of χεῖρ might have been expected, the phrase ὤλοντο διὰ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ gives good sense in the Gk and is consistent with the idea of the destruction of Edom by her neighbours (cf. v. 10 ὡς κλέπτει ἐν νυκτὶ ἐπιθήσουσι χεῖρα αὐτῶν (MT aliter) and further Ob 18-21). According to the reading ὤλοντο ἐπὶ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ the sense would have to be that Edom's neighbour has also perished, which is certainly in line with the Heb but ought not to constitute a reason for emending. In fact, earlier commentators, e.g., Schwally (p. 201), Giesebrecht (p. 242), and Duhm (p. 355) preferred the LXX reading διὰ χεῖρα in favour of the MT on the judgement that the phrase can only speak of Edom's destruction, not that of her neighbours. They may have been wrong in that opinion, but perhaps the LXX reading ὤλοντο διὰ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ reflects a similar reasoning.

5. If διὰ χεῖρα is the original reading in 29:11, it may be significant that both the immediately preceding and following occurrences of χεῖρ in LXX Jer also derive from mistranslations of the Hebrew (cf. 29:10(49:9) from אֶת --presumably as a result of actual or imagined metathesis--and 31(48):26 from יָנִיּוּ). These facts point either to a poorly copied Hebrew Vorlage or to a loose handling of the text.

6. Since Ziegler himself admits that "Man könnte den Überlieferten Text halten und ihn erklären in Abhängigkeit von v. 10 ἐπιθήσουσι χεῖρα αὐτῶν " and since the conjectural emendation is not without its own disadvantages, it is necessary to recommend once more that the critical text stay with the best MS reading and that the conjectured reading be referred to the apparatus.

29:22(49:21) ἐν θαλάσῃ σουφ

καὶ κραυγὴ ἐν θαλάσῃ σουφ ἡκούσθη נחשן הים ד'ב הרש

ἐν θαλάσῃ σουφ] θαλάσσης οὐκ B-S; σου ἐν θαλάσῃ (+ερυθρ. OL) rel.

The conjectured transliteration σουφ / η 10 was first proposed in the "Prolegomena" to the prophetic books of Grabe's edition of the LXX (III, 1720). It was thereafter approved by J.L. Schulze in his edition of the commentary of Theodoret (II, 606, n. 82, 1770), by Spohn (II, 390), Streane (p. 284), Wutz (p. 29), and Rudolph (ZAW, p. 278). However, the exact form of the phrase in which σουφ was restored varied slightly among these commentators. Grabe⁴³ and Spohn recommended κραυγὴ ἐν θαλάσῃ σουφ as the original reading, whereas Schulze, Wutz, and Rudolph based the emendation on the text of B, hence κραυγὴ θαλάσσης σουφ. Ziegler's reference in the critical apparatus to Wutz, and in Beiträge, p. 68, to Spohn, Streane, Wutz, and Rudolph as all substantiating the reading κραυγὴ ἐν θαλάσῃ σουφ is slightly misleading. Only Grabe and Spohn proposed the phrase in that form.

In favour of the conjectured reading σουφ as representing the original LXX we may cite the following points:

1. There is a well attested affinity for transliteration in the LXX of Jer, particularly in the latter half of the book, cf. the discussion above of Α.θαμ(-ν)/ η 10 (p.150). Since the transmission of proper names is especially vulnerable to scribal corruption, it is quite possible that an original transliteration has been obscured in the extant MS evidence of 29:22.

2. Once elsewhere in the LXX η 10 0' has been transliterated, namely in the B text of Jud 11:16 (θαλάσσης Σιφ vs. the A text reading θαλάσσης ἱερυθρῆς = the conventional LXX rendering of η 10 0'⁴⁴).

3. The Gk corruption $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ in the B text could be easily explained by haplography of Σ (with further slight modification of $\Phi \rightarrow \kappa$ to read $\omicron\gamma\kappa$).

The question remains whether this conjecture should be adopted into the critical text. The following considerations need to be weighed:

1. If $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$ is to be accepted as the original Gk here, we would prefer the emendation on the basis of the B text rather than the A text. In other words, we should prefer $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$ to $\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta$ $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$. The A Q O L reading $\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta$ sounds very much like a pre-Hexaplaric approximation to the Heb $\square\gamma\aleph$. Also it is easier to explain the reading $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ as a corruption of $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$ (see above #3), than it is to explain the corruption $\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta$ from a presumed original $\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta$ $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$. The latter explanation involves a major dislocation of $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$ from a position following $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta$ to a position preceding it, the ϕ dropping out in the process.

2. Other explanations of the B reading $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ have been offered. Coste (p. 31) suggested that $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ could be traced to a loose translation of $\eta\iota\theta$ read as $\eta\iota\theta$ (finis). Streane, who saw in $\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ of the A text the remains of an original $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$, nevertheless had another explanation for the appearance of $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ in B. He discovered numerous instances of the translator's apparently arbitrary handling of the negative in Gk, sometimes inserting it, sometimes omitting it without correspondence to the Heb.⁴⁵ The presence of an unexplained $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ in 29:22 need not be seen as a novelty, therefore. Although Coste's proposal is not persuasive (Ziegler: "Coste. . . kommt nicht in Frage"), Streane's documentation of the loose handling of the negative needs further consideration. In short, the B reading could be referred back to the translator himself, and Spohn's blanket statement, "lectio Cod. Vat. $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$

absurda" may be misleading.

3. On the principle that the safest way to edit a critical text of the LXX is to print only hitherto attested MS readings, we propose that the text should follow B and read *κραυγὴ θαλάσσης οὐκ ἠκούσθη*. If an attempt is made to reach behind the archetype then it can be said that the conjectured reading *Σουφ* is the most persuasive of the five emendations adopted by Ziegler in the text of Jer 29. Even so, the reading should be *θαλάσσης Σουφ* following B, rather than *ἐν θαλάσσει Σουφ* following A.

Concluding Remarks

In the above proposed emendations we are again aware of a text-critical tension, this time between the Gk witness on the one hand (sometimes a uniform Gk witness) and the witness of the Heb MT on the other. The discussion of these emendations in the accompanying monograph, Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta, is usually carried on with reference to how the Gk translator would have rendered the Heb that lay before him, and the net effect of Ziegler's decisions is usually to bring the Gk text more in line with the Heb. Methodologically the procedure is open to some question since the discussion is based largely on the present MT text; furthermore, even where the translator's Heb Vorlage can be equated with the MT it is always precarious to assume how the translator may have proceeded with regard to this text. If and where it is deemed essential to incorporate a conjectural emendation into the body of the text I should at least like to see the reader alerted to its character as a conjecture by the use of some typographical means such as being placed within daggers or other appropriate symbols.⁴⁶ It is true that the corresponding MS evidence is always cited by Ziegler in the apparatus, but it is no less true that it is a laborious thing to read a text always with an eye on every detail in the apparatus. Ziegler's conjectured readings are never extreme (Walters, for instance,

wanted to go much beyond him⁴⁷ and we may be grateful to him for recording the existence of different readings than those contained in the MSS but which may go behind the archetype to the original translation.⁴⁸ But even so, as a reader of the LXX I would feel more confident if conjectural emendations in Ziegler's text were even further reduced and where he insists that they be adopted that they be clearly marked.

CHAPTER 4

THE TRANSLATOR/REVISER PROBLEM: A CRITIQUE OF E. TOV'S CHALLENGE TO THE MULTIPLE TRANSLATOR THEORY FOR THE BOOK OF JER

Discussion of the text-critical problem of Jer 29 in Chs. 2 and 3 of this thesis has shown that an archetype text for the oracles against the Philistines and Edom from which all extant witnesses have descended can be posited and restored within a reasonable margin of probability. But once restored, what does this archetype text represent? As we have seen, the question was not directly treated by Ziegler, though indirect comments in Beiträge suggest that his text is intended to represent the closest possible approximation to the original translation as it left the hand of the translator(s). But at this point a complicating factor emerges. As noted in Ch. 1 (p. 8), it is precisely at Jer 29 that certain lexical differences between preceding and subsequent chapters in Jer begin to appear. The standard explanation for this phenomenon since the days of Thackeray has been to attribute the differences to the work of two distinct translators;¹ but in a thesis presented in 1973 to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and published in 1976 under the title The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8, Emanuel Tov has questioned this consensus view and proposed instead a translator/reviser theory for the book of Jer. Essentially Tov's hypothesis proceeds from the observation that there exist in the two major parts of Jer not only important differences but equally important similarities, especially such as mark Jer off from the rest of the LXX ("distinctive" similarities). Thackeray had also noticed some of these similarities but tended to accord them a secondary status. Tov believes that it is Thackeray's failure to take seriously these unique similarities which undermines the multiple translator

explanation for Jer and invites instead the substitution of a translator/reviser theory.

Interestingly enough, the stimulus for Tov's investigation was provided by a footnote in Ziegler's "Einleitung" to his text where the editor noted his general agreements with Thackeray's statistics but at the same time posed the question "ob wirklich zwei Übersetzer beteiligt waren oder bloss ein Redaktor am Werk war, der den einen Teil nur überarbeitete" (p. 128, n. 1); however, Ziegler never followed through exploring the implications of his proposal or integrating it into his discussion.² Tov quotes Ziegler's footnote in full (p. 4), but the theory ultimately adopted by Tov differs somewhat from Ziegler's original suggestion. Whereas Ziegler advanced the possibility of a reviser for the second half of Jer only, Tov envisages an original revision for the entire book (including Bar 1:1-3:8); at a later stage (according to this theory) when the book came to be copied in codex form, two different MSS were inadvertently chosen, one containing the first half of the book from the unrevised tradition and the second half from the revised tradition. This hybrid form then became the archetype for all subsequent recopyings of the book with the result that the second half of the original Jer along with the first half of the revised Jer have been altogether lost to us.³ Like Thackeray, Tov extended his analysis to the book of Baruch, as well as to the books of Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets, for further elaboration and support for the theory.

In the following sections we hope to illustrate the problems involved in the multiple translator and translator/reviser theories and on the basis of the data provided by the oracles against the Philistines and Edom evaluate the strength and weaknesses of Tov's counter-proposals. The discussion will be dealt with according to the following outline:

- I. Similarities Between Jer a' and b'
- II. Differences Between Jer a' and b'
- III. Conclusions

I. Similarities Between Jer a' and Jer b'

The springboard chapter for Tov is his discussion of the semantic similarities between Jer a' and b' (Ch. II, pp. 19-36). In this section the author delineates two types of similarities: the first has to do with unique and rare renditions found in Jer a' and b' (#1-30, pp. 24-32), the second with rare (i.e. "rare" to the LXX) Gk words common to both parts (#31-45, pp. 32-36). Both categories are well represented by examples from Jer 29 and these will be analysed below according to their verse sequence in the chapter. References in brackets at the commencement of each new word discussed are to Tov's book. Our concern is with testing the validity of the examples brought forth in defence of Tov's case and in exploring the possibility of alternate explanations where such may exist.

29(47):2 ἀλλὰ λ᾿ ἄζω (II 6, p. 25)

καὶ ἀλλὰ λ᾿ ἄξουσιν ἅπαντες
οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν

פְּרַחֲהוּ בַּיּוֹם לְ לְלִי

The translation equivalence ἀλλὰ λ᾿ ἄζω / לְלִי which is found in Jer b' at 29(47):2, 30(49):3, 32:20(25:34), and possibly at 31(48):39 (a conjectural emendation in Ziegler's text), occurs once also in Jer a' at 4:8. This translation is unique to Jer and hence is cited by Tov as strong support for the theory that the same translator was responsible for both parts.

At the heart of the problem is the question whether the equivalence ἀλλὰ λ᾿ ἄζω / לְלִי is to be regarded too exceptional for it to have originated independently in two different translators. But this question must be answered in the negative. Outside Jer the most frequent translation of לְלִי is ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν (also employed twice in Jer b', 31(48):20, 31), which, both in sound and meaning is

very similar to $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$. Since both $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ have to do with crying aloud in various contexts,⁴ it seems not unreasonable to think that either word might have suggested itself to different translators as a suitable rendition of $\text{ל} \cdot \text{ל} \cdot \text{ה}$. This argument is somewhat weakened by the example of Aquila who regularly reserved $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ for the translation of the hiphil of וּרַחַם while using $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ for the hiphil of לָלַחַם , but few, if any, were as consistent as Aquila in their choice of translation equivalents. On the other occasion in which $\text{ל} \cdot \text{ל} \cdot \text{ה}$ occurs in Jer a', for instance, it is rendered by $\theta\rho\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\omega$ (28:8). We conclude that the sole occurrence of $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ in Jer a' and the three occurrences in Jer b' is ambiguous evidence for the identity of translator in Jer a' and b'.

29(47):2 $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ (II 19, p. 29)

καὶ ἀλαλέουσιν ἅπαντες
οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν

וְהִלְלִי כָּל יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ

The standard translation of $\text{ל} \cdot \text{ל} \cdot \text{ה}$ in the LXX is simply by the appropriate form of $\pi\alpha\varsigma$. However, there are also a number of instances where the alternate form $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ occur. According to Thackeray (Grammar, p. 138), the use of this form appears to be due in most cases to a regard for euphony, i.e., to avoid the harsh juxtaposition of consonants at the close of one word and at the beginning of the next. The converse of this is that $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ should not be used following a word ending with a vowel.

Tov has gathered together some statistics on the use of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in both parts of Jer in comparison with its frequency in the rest of the LXX and on the basis of these statistics has concluded that "the original translator (or the first scribe?) of Jer thus used $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ more than his fellow translators"--another case where it is assumed Jer a' and b' share a common trait over

against the rest of the LXX. The totals which Tov gives are as follows:

Occurrences listed in HR: Jer a': 9; Jer b': 16; elsewhere: 35.
Occurrences in MS B only: Jer a': 3; Jer b': 11; elsewhere: 17.

These totals need to be modified as follows: The listing in HR of the second $\alpha\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in 16:10 is a mistake in that concordance, thus reducing the actual number for Jer a' to 8. Also in HR there are 15 rather than 16 occurrences of $\alpha\pi\alpha\varsigma$ listed for Jer b'. In MS B there are 4 rather than 3 occurrences of $\alpha\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in Jer a'. But the real question concerns the usefulness of the above lists from HR and Codex B. HR merely give an aggregate of the occurrences found in the major uncials A B S and the Sixtine text, whereas Codex B, while the major witness to the B group, is certainly far from infallible. A very different picture emerges if we turn to the critical texts of Rahlfs and Ziegler where one expects the MS evidence to have been digested and evaluated. The adjusted totals when the four sources, HR, Codex B, Rahlfs, and Ziegler are compared are as follows:

	<u>Jer a'</u>	<u>Jer b'</u>	<u>Elsewhere</u>
HR	8	15	35
Codex B	4	11	17
Rahlfs ⁵	6	11	22
Ziegler ⁶	3	6	--

Using Ziegler's statistics, the frequency of $\alpha\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in Jer is only marginally greater than in other books. However, what may be of even more significance, is the fact that no matter what set of calculations is used, Jer b' always has a higher frequency of occurrences than Jer a', an observation that could be taken as an argument for the difference rather than for the similarity between the two parts.

29(47): 5 ἀπορρίπτω (II 2, p. 24)

ἀπερρίφη Ασκαλων

יִבְרַח הַחֵטִי

In the LXX of Jer 8:14(2x), 28(51):6, 29(47):5, Hos 10:7,15, and Ob 5, the Heb verbs חָטַח ("to cease, cut off, destroy") and דָּחַח ("grow dumb, silent, still") are unexpectedly rendered by forms of ἀπορρίπτω (once also by the simplex form ῥίπτω in Jer 27(50):30). Tov sees in this common rendition at Jer 8:14, 28:6 (Jer a'), and 29:5 (Jer b') his second most persuasive example for the identity of translators in the Old Gk of Jer.

The equivalence ἀπορρίπτω / חָטַח (דָּחַח) can be explained as reflecting variants from the root חָטַח ("to throw, shoot"). However, Tov does not believe that the translator's parent text actually contained the variant letter ח; rather he prefers to regard this as a "pseudo-variant", by which he means that the translator for the purposes of translation only read the word with a resh rather than a daleth, presumably because he was uncertain about the meaning of the Heb חָטַח / דָּחַח or because the word חָטַח made more sense to him in the context. In a separate article in JSS 20 (1975), 165-177, Tov has developed this concept of "pseudo-variants" further with several examples, including the one presently under consideration (pp. 172-173).

However, the matter is by no means settled and it is not clear to us that the translation of חָטַח by ἀπερρίφη in 29:5 represents the cogent evidence for a unity of translators in Jer a' and b' that Tov attributes to it. For one thing, ἀπορρίπτω is not the only translation of חָטַח / דָּחַח in Jer; additionally we find τὸ ὕψος σου 6:2, διελείπω 14:17, πίπτω 30:15(49:26), ἔπιπλεω 29(47):6, and παύομαι 31(48):2, 32:23(25:37). While the translations τὸ ὕψος σου, διελείπω, πίπτω and ἔπιπλεω may be taken to reflect uncertainty with regard to the meaning of the Heb⁷ and hence provide additional support for Tov's case, the translation

by παύομαι in 31(48):2 and 32:23(25:37) is a reasonably correct one. This translation is not referred to in Tov's monograph but is dealt with in a footnote in the JSS article (p. 172, n. 4). The explanation given there for the correct translation at two points in Jer b' is that παύομαι must represent examples of correction by the postulated reviser of the book; the reviser's failure to correct at 29:5 is merely a matter of inconsistency. If this conjectural solution is not convincing to us, Tov invites us to consider the co-existence of correct and incorrect translations of the same Heb word in other translation units, e.g., the widely divergent translations of the Heb in Is 38:2 and 38:7.

It is important to note that Tov's case for identity of translators at 8:14, 28:6, 29:5 depends on the assumption that the translation ἀπορρίπτω was occasioned by the same mental process (deliberate substitution of 7 for 7). If the scribal variant already existed in the translator's Vorlage the matter would, of course, be very different. There is no way that this question can be solved at present, but it does point out the inferential and hypothetical nature of the evidence. When this is taken into account along with the embarrassment of the correct rendition at 31:2 and 32:23, then we see that the use of ἀπορρίπτω for הִט / הִט may not represent unequivocal evidence for a unity of translators in Jer a' and b'.

29:8(49:7) οἶχομαι (II 25, pp. 30-31)

ῥέχετο σοφία αὐτοῦ

הִטְחָה הַחֵכֶם

The verb οἶχομαι is found a total of 21 times in the translated books of the LXX, almost half (10) of these occurrences being confined to the book of Jer. In most of these instances, οἶχομαι translates the verb חָטָה, one of nearly 90 different words employed in the LXX to render this common Heb verb. However, in Jer 29:8(49:7)⁸ οἶχομαι renders the niphal

of the root נָרַם (a form found only here).

The rate of occurrence of οἴχομαι in Jer is admittedly above the average for the LXX and could point to a special preference for this verb by the presumed single translator of the Old Gk of Jer. On the other hand, it may be questioned whether the equivalence οἴχομαι / נָרַם can legitimately be called rare (as Tov does) since outside Jer it occurs 3 times in Gen, twice in Job and once in 2 Chr. What is "rare" indeed is the use of οἴχομαι for the niphal of נָרַם, but then this does not appear overly significant either since the root נָרַם was rendered by a different Gk word on each of the seven occasions that it was encountered in the translation of the LXX. Looking at the distribution of οἴχομαι in Jer from a different perspective, one could--as in the case of ἴππας--with equal justification emphasize the significantly different ratio of 3:7 with which οἴχομαι appears in Jer a' : Jer b', and hence argue for different translators.

29:17(49:16)	<u>ἐγχειρέω</u>	(II 31, p. 32)
"	<u>ἰταμία</u>	(II 36, p. 34)
"	<u>τρυμαλιά</u>	(II 41, p. 35)

ἡ παιγνία σου ἐνεχείρησε σοι
ἰταμία καρδίας σου
 κατέλυσε τρυμαλιάς πετρῶν

תָּהָא הָעֵשׂה תִּפְלֵסֶנּוּ
 יָדוֹן לִבְךָ
 שִׁכְנִי בְּחֻגֵי הַסֵּלֶע

In 29:17 Tov notes three examples of words common to Jer a' and b' which recur rarely, if at all, elsewhere in the LXX. These are ἐγχειρέω, ἰταμία, and τρυμαλιά, the first of which is also the first--presumably most important--example in Tov's list of "Rare Greek Words Common to Jer a' and b'" (pp. 32ff.).

ἐγχειρέω, an otherwise not uncommon Gk verb (cf. LSJ), is found in the LXX only in Jer 18:22, 28:12, 29:17, and

2 Chr 23:18, each time translating a different Heb verb (הָרַחֵם , הָרַחֵם , הָרַחֵם). Yet it is difficult to know how to evaluate the significance of this kind of data. It is possible to turn to other examples of Gk words rarely employed in the LXX without deducing anything about common authorship; we mention only one of several possible examples: the verb ἐπισκοπέω . This word occurs only five times in the entire LXX--Deut 11:12, 2 Re 2:30, 2 Chr 34:12, Es 2:11, and Prov 19:23--each time translating a different Heb word, yet no one would want to claim that the use of ἐπισκοπέω in the books mentioned has anything to do with identity of translators. The rendition at Jer 29:17(49:16) evidently resulted from a confusion of the hiphil of נָשָׂא with the qal of נָשָׂא (similarly in 44(37):9); but when we consider that the qal of נָשָׂא was translated in the LXX by some 90 different Gk words (cf. dos Santos, p. 137), then it seems we have the right to expect almost anything as a translation of this verb and perhaps should not read too much into the choice of ἐγχειρίω .

ἰταμία is a word hitherto attested nowhere else in Gk literature except in Jer 29:17 and the majority text of 30 (49):4, though rejected in the latter instance by both Ziegler and Walters in favour of ἀτιμία (see Walters, Text, p. 294, n. 88). The adjective ἰταμός , on the other hand, which in the LXX is found only in Jer 6:23 and 27(50):42, is otherwise widely employed in ancient Gk. For our present purposes the question is whether the use of ἰταμός in Jer a' to translate הָרַחֵם and ἰταμία in Jer b' to translate הָרַחֵם can be taken as evidence for a single translator of both parts of the book, as Tov claims. It seems likely that the translation of הָרַחֵם by ἰταμός in both 6:23 and 27:42 is related since the two verses are parallel passages. Whether the argument can be extended to include the hapax ἰταμία in 29:17 is another matter; while one would not want to exclude the possibility, it is a difficult point to prove.

τρυμαδιά is likewise a word attested only within biblical Gk--though more frequently than ἰταμία --being equivalent to the more common word for "hole", τρύμη. In Jer 13:14 and 16:16 it is employed to render רִפְּל, while in 29:17(49:16) it translates רָלַח. Outside Jer it is found in the LXX only 3 times in the B text of Judges: 6:2 (for רָלַח; A has the transliteration μανδρα), 15:8,11 (for רִפְּל; A has σπήλαιον and ὀπή respectively). Outside the LXX proper it is found further in Symmachus' translation at Is 51:1 and in Mark's "eye of the needle" passage, Mk 10:25. Its use in both parts of Jer may be significant and could point to some relationship between the two parts; however, the nature of that relationship--if it exists--is by no means clear on the basis of this word.

29:19(49:18) παντοκράτωρ (II 26, p. 31)

εἶπε κύριος παντοκράτωρ

יהוה רב

In this verse we have the interesting case of a prophetic formula being longer in the LXX than in the MT (the reverse of the general tendency in Jer); why this should be so is a problem in itself (see discussion in next chapter, pp. 236-238), but what concerns us for the present is the recognition that throughout Jer παντοκράτωρ is the standard translation of the divine name יהוה רב (whether or not that word was actually present in the translator's Heb Vorlage at 29:19(49:18)). Including its use at 29:19, the name παντοκράτωρ is found in Jer altogether 14 times, 7 times in Jer a' and 7 times in Jer b'. Other renditions of יהוה רב in the LXX are κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων and the transliteration κ. σαβαωθ. A table summarizing the relevant statistics appears as follows:⁹

	<u>σαβωωθ</u> ¹⁰	<u>παντοκράτωρ</u> ¹¹	<u>τῶν δυνάμεων</u> ¹²
Josh	1	-	1
1-2 Re	5	4	2
3-4 Re	-	2	5
1 Chr	-	3	-
1 Esd	1	-	-
Pss	-	-	15
Sir	-	1	-
MP	-	101	-
Is	54	-	-
Jer	-	14	-
Bar	-	2	-

On the basis of these statistics, Tov makes the observation that "only in Jer and the MP is the phrase [תַּיְהוָה הַגָּדֹל] rendered exclusively by κύριος παντοκράτωρ", the implication being that therefore both parts of Jer and the MP were rendered by the same translator. Tov's observation on παντοκράτωρ is not altogether accurate since the appearance of the phrase κύριος παντοκράτωρ in 1 Chr (3x) and Sir (1x) also fits into the same "exclusive" category as Jer and MP, though it certainly is true that the concentration of occurrences of παντοκράτωρ is found in Jer and MP. But whether this is necessarily a witness to the identity of translators for Jer a', Jer b', and MP is a question less readily answered. Even if the explanation of some sort of inter-dependence lies near at hand, need this be one of single translator theory?¹³

On the assumption of a reviser theory for Jer b' one might wonder why παντοκράτωρ --the most idiomatic rendition of תַּיְהוָה הַגָּדֹל in the LXX--was not changed either to the transliteration σαβωωθ or to the more literal translations τῶν δυνάμεων or τῶν στρατιῶν. The fact that παντοκράτωρ was a good candidate for revision can be seen by the preference on the part of the younger Gk translators/revisers for precisely the forms δυνάμεων (Theodotion, Origen, Symmachus) and στρατιῶν (Aquila, Symmachus).

The fact that the word was not revised in Jer b' can only be explained on this theory as another example of the reviser's inconsistency.

29:20(49:19) ἐκδιώκω (II 29, p. 32)

" ἀνθίστημι (II 30, p. 32)

In 29:20(49:19) there occur two translation equivalents (ἐκδιώκω / γῆ and ἀνθίστημι / הוּעִי) which are found elsewhere only in Jer 27(50):44 (and in the case of ἀνθίστημι / הוּעִי also in Job 9:19). The two verses 29:20(49:19) and 27(50):44 are in fact almost identical parallels which it will be useful to reproduce for comparison purposes:

ἰδοὺ ὥσπερ λέων ἀναβήσεται
הנה כנה יה יעלה

ἐκ μέσου τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς
τόπον Αἰθαμ
מגאון הירדן אל נה איתן

ὅτι τάχῃ ἐκδιώξω αὐτοὺς ἀπ'αὐτῆς
כי תגדענה מלכיה

καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ'αὐτὴν
ἐπιστήσατε
ומי בחור עליה תפצח

ὅτι τίς ὥσπερ ἐγώ; καὶ τίς
ἀντιστήσεται μοι;
כי מי כמוני ומי יעידני

καὶ τίς οὗτος ποιμήν, ὃς
στήσεται κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου;
ומי זה רעה אשר יעמד לפני

ἰδοὺ ὥσπερ λέων ἀναβήσεται
הנה כנה יה יעלה

ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς
Αἰθαμ
מגאון הירדן אל נה איתן

ὅτι ταχέως ἐκδιώξω αὐτοὺς ἀπ'αὐτῆς
כי תגדענה מלכיה

καὶ πάντα νεανίσκον ἐπ'αὐτὴν
ἐπιστήσω
ומי בחור עליה תפצח

ὅτι τίς ὥσπερ ἐγώ; καὶ τίς
ἀντιστήσεται μοι;
כי מי כמוני ומי יועידני

καὶ τίς οὗτος ποιμήν, ὃς
στήσεται κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου;
ומי זה רעה אשר יעמד לפני

It will be noted that the Heb passages are identical except for the slight variations $\text{וְיָרֵם} \ 49:19 / \text{וְיָרֵם}$ 50:44 and $\text{וְיָרֵם} \ 49:19 / \text{וְיָרֵם}$ 50:44. The Gk translations are also very similar, the only variations being the following:

29:20

ἐκ μέσου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ
εἰς τόπον Α.Θαμ
ὅτι ταχύ
καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους
ἐπιστήσατε

27:44

ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ
εἰς Α.Θαμ
ὅτι ταχέως
καὶ πάντα νεανίσκον
ἐπιστήσω

However the above differences are to be explained (some may be due to a different Vorlage from our MT), it is nevertheless the remarkable similarities between the two passages that demand particular attention for the moment. It does seem clear that there must be some intrinsic connection between the similar renderings other than mere chance. The theory of one and the same translator being responsible for both passages is one plausible explanation. Yet there is a weakness to this solution when it is invoked overmuch: there is namely no guarantee that a single translator would render the same passage in identical fashion twice; in fact, the likelihood is that he would not, so that where exact reduplication occurs we have the right to suspect the intervention of secondary influences. Deliberate reference back to the first rendition by the one translator is a possibility; but if this be allowed, then cross-consultation by a second translator should not be peremptorily ruled out either.

It is not certain therefore that the same translation equivalents $\text{ἐκδιδώκω} / \text{יָרֵם}$ and $\text{ἀνθίστημι} / \text{הוֹצִיָה}$ in the parallel passages 29:20(49:19) and 27(50):44 demand a single translator theory for the Old Gk of Jer. ἐκδιδώκω is not an unreasonable translation of יָרֵם (cf. the translation of יָרֵם by διδώκω in Am 6:13(12), Hab 2:2, Hag 1:19, and by καταδιδώκω in Joel 2:4). Furthermore, although

Tov states (p. 23) that harmonization between parallel passages is an unlikely explanation for vocabulary similarities, yet it seems that in 29:20 a good case for some kind of harmonization could be made for the translation $\xi\kappa\delta\iota\omega\acute{\xi}\omega$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ of

$\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ (cf. $\xi\kappa\delta\iota\omega\acute{\xi}\omega$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ / $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ 27(50):44).

As for the equivalence $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ / $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ in the two parallel passages of Jer and in Job 9:19, it should be observed that these are the only occurrences of the hiphil of $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ in the MT and that the translation by $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ evidently derives from an association with the root $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ which on several occasions in the LXX was rendered by $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ (cf. Josh 21:42, 23:9, Jud 2:14, Esth 9:2, Ps 75(76):7, Ob 11, Is 50:8, Dan LXX 10:13, 11:2, 15, 16). Also, as Tov points out, the possibility of a different Vorlage at MT 49:19 needs to be reckoned with in view of the translation $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ by Aquila and Symmachus.

29:21(49:20) $\sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega$ (II 37, p. 34)

$\text{Εάν μὴ } \sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\eta\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota$
 $\tauὰ \epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha \tauῶν \pi\rho\omicron\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$

$\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$
 $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$

The verb $\sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega$ occurs in the LXX 3 times only-- Jer 22:19, 29:21(49:20), 31(48):33--and hence serves as another example in Tov's list of rare Gk words common to Jer a' and b'. As with $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ above, however, it needs to be pointed out that whilst the verb is of rare occurrence in the LXX it is by no means rare in the Gk language at large. Nor is the equivalence $\sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega$ / $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ (both at 22:19 and 29:21(49:20)) at all unreasonable. In fact in 27(40):45, the parallel passage to 29:21(49:20), where the LXX renders $\text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל} \text{ל}$ by $\delta\iota\omega\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$, Aquila prefers $\sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega$. In short, the use of $\sigma\upsilon\mu\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega$ in the 3 instances of Jer appears only mildly noteworthy.

29:22(49:21) πτῶσις

(II 5, p. 25)

ὅτι ἀπὸ φωνῆς πτῶσεως
αὐτῶν ἐφοβήθη ἡ γῆ

חֲקוֹל נִפְלֵם רַעַשָׁהּ הָאָרֶץ

The word πτῶσις occurs elsewhere in Jer only at 6:15 in the following context:

διὰ τοῦτο πτοσῶνται ἐν
τῇ πτώσει αὐτῶν

לְכֹן יִפְּלוּ בַּנִּפְלִים

In the LXX as a whole, according to HR, πτῶσις occurs 21 times, 9 times as a translation of some form derived from נָפַל, 7 times as a translation of a form derived from נָגַף, once each as a translation of נָסַח and הִלָּחֵץ, and 3 times with uncertain Heb equivalence. It is true that only in Jer does πτῶσις render a form of the participle נִפְּלִים and of the infinitive נִפְּלוּ, but it seems unwise to read too much into this. After all, the natural and standard translation of נָפַל throughout the LXX is the verb πίπτω (according to dos Santos 252 times), and it seems a logical extension to employ the related noun πτῶσις for the appropriate form derived from the root נָפַל. The use of πτῶσις for the participle form in 6:15 and the infinitive in 29:22(49:21) is therefore scant support for the unity of translators in Jer a' and b'.

II. Differences Between Jer a' and b'

In Chs. III and IV Tov turns to a consideration of the differences between Jer a' and b', traditionally the most noteworthy feature of the Gk style and vocabulary of this LXX book. Tov discerns two major types of differences: those which he believes betray some revisional tendency in Jer b' (Ch. III) and those which do not (Ch. IV). In the first category (Ch. III), he further sub-divides the differences according to the presumed Tendenz discovered: 1) "More Precise Renditions" (#1-11, pp. 46-52), 2) "Corrections of Erroneous Renditions" (#12-17, pp. 52-55), 3) "Stereotyped (literal) Replacing Non-stereotyped (free) Renditions" (#18-41, pp. 55-68), 4) "Renditions Reflecting the Heb in a More Consistent Way" (#42-48, pp. 69-74), and 5) "Other Changes" (#49-51, pp. 74-75). Ch. IV (pp. 93-106) which contains 24 examples of what are termed "synonymous renditions" is not subdivided further in any way. In the discussion below, differences between Jer a' and b' illustrated by Jer 29 will again be reviewed according to their sequence of appearance in the chapter.

29(47):1 τάδε λέγει κύριος (III 18, pp. 56-58)

τάδε λέγει κύριος

כה אמר יהוה

Probably the most arresting difference between the two halves of Jer is the way the messenger formula (MF) כה אמר יהוה is rendered in the respective parts of the book. Whereas in the first half the almost unanimous form is τάδε λέγει κύριος, in the second half the dominant rendition is οὕτως εἶπε κύριος, with the occasional alternate form οὕτως λέγει κύριος. For Jer the statistics on the MF are as follows: τάδε λέγει 64; οὕτως εἶπε 71; οὕτως λέγει 4; missing in Gk, 14.¹⁴ In order to appreciate the significance of these numbers they need to be set in the wider context of the translation of the MF in the rest of the OT (predominately employed with divine name but occasionally with profane name). The relevant statistics are as follows: ¹⁵

	<u>τάδε λέγει δεῖνα</u> ¹⁶	<u>οὕτως εἶπε δεῖνα</u> ¹⁷	<u>οὕτως λέγει δεῖνα</u> ¹⁸
Gen	1	-	1
Ex	11	-	-
Num	2	-	-
Josh	3	-	-
Jud	2	-	1
1-2 Re	6	-	1
3-4 Re	42	-	-
1-2 Chr	7	4	4
2 Esd	-	1	-
MP	44	-	-
Is	18	4	26
Jer a'	61	-	2
Jer b'	3	71	2
Ez	122	-	-

Miscellaneous variations are τάδε εἶπε (1 Re 10:18, 15:2, Jer 29:13 B-S-538), οὕτως ἔλεγεν (1 Re 16:7), τάδε ἔλεγεν (1 Re 9:9), τότε εἶπε (Jer 19:1), and καὶ εἶπε (Am 1:3). The MS evidence for the various forms of the MF in Jer is generally stable, though there are some significant variants, particularly in the O and L recensions.¹⁹

As can be seen, the most popular translation by far of the MF in the LXX is τάδε λέγει, while οὕτως εἶπε is seldom found outside Jer and οὕτως λέγει is confined mainly to Is. When Thackeray discovered the different renditions of the MF in the two main parts of Jer--not at the beginning but at the end of his investigations (Jewish Worship, p. 35)--he took it as the capstone proof of his multiple translator theory. Tov, however, interprets the data differently; for him, the form οὕτως εἶπε bears the marks of revision. While the common expression τάδε λέγει has classical antecedents (cf. LSJ, λέγω, III 8), for Tov οὕτως εἶπε exemplifies the reviser's tendency to replace non-stereotyped or free renditions with stereotyped or literal renditions (outside the MF the stereotyped rendition of the Heb particle כֹּכֵן is οὕτως, while the Heb וַיֹּאמֶר is normally translated

by the aorist εἶπε rather than by the present λέγει).

We can readily agree that the Gk οὕτως, εἶπε represents a more literal translation of the Heb כִּכֵּן כֵּן than does τῶς λέγει . But what is not certain is the interpretation that should be placed on these facts. The source of the more literal phrase is entirely a matter of conjecture; there is nothing in the phrase itself which would tell us whether it comes from a literally minded translator or reviser. In the absence of explicit MS information, this question cannot be satisfactorily answered by a mere statistical count of the various forms.

29(47):3 Omission of the article in the phrase ἀπὸ φωνῆς
ὁρμῆς αὐτοῦ (III 32b, p. 64)

ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὁρμῆς αὐτοῦ

נשנש בִּי רח

Tov draws attention to one of the conclusions reached by Ziegler in his excellent study on the use of the article in LXX Jer (Beiträge, Ch. 4), namely the comment that "Der Artikel ist oftmals in der Ier.-und Thr.-LXX im Anschluss an MT (also besonders beim Status constructus) nicht gesetzt worden. Er fehlt häufiger in Ier. II und Thr. als in Ier. I" (p. 167). By way of illustrating the tendency of Jer b' to omit the article more frequently than Jer a' in various syntactical constructions, Tov contrasts the translation of כִּכֵּן כֵּן in 13:22 by διὰ τὸ πλῆθος, τῆς ἀδικίας with the phrase from 29(47):3 cited above (both constructions being of the type "prep. + double noun"). Tov includes this example in the section "Stereotyped (literal) Replacing Non-stereotyped (free) Renditions", the implication being that Jer b' would frequently have eliminated the article from the original LXX in conformity with the Heb. But as Ziegler has pointed out, the determination of the article in LXX Jer (and elsewhere) is an extremely complicated business, the MS evidence seldom being homogeneous. Even accepting the validity of Ziegler's generalization regarding the higher rate

of omission of the article in Jer b', it is questionable whether this proves anything about the intervention of a reviser or whether it is to be attributed to the style of an original translator.

29(47):4 ἀπόλλυμι (III 2, p. 47)

τοῦ ἀπολίσσαι πάντας τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους נִשְׁמַדְוּ כָּל הַגּוֹיִם

The Heb verb טַו is found 3 times in the oracles against the Philistines and Edom, each time rendered in a different way:
29(47):4 ἀπόλλυμι and ἔξολεθρεύω, 29:11(49:10) ὀλλυμι. For Jer as a whole, the translation pattern for טַו appears as follows:²⁰

	Jer a'	Jer b'
ταλαιπωρέω	6	-
ὀλλυμι	-	6
ἀπόλλυμι	-	1
(ἐξ)ολεθρεύω	3	1
πλήσσω Q-613 Zi.	-	1
(πίπλημι rel.)		

Related to the above are the translations of טַו and טַוּ which appear 5 times in Jer a' as ταλαιπωρία and 3 times in Jer b' as ὄλεθρος. ²¹

On the basis of the above statistics Tov has concluded that the root ταλαιπωρ- was revised by Jer-R to the stronger (ἀπ)όλλυμι, since "ταλαιπωρ- ('to endure hardship') does not precisely represent טַו ('to devastate', 'to plunder'; generally in passive 'to be destroyed')". No MS evidence remains, of course, of the presumed original ταλαιπωρέω / -ρία readings in Jer b' so our explanation for the presence of the (ἀπ)όλλυμι / ὄλεθρος readings there has to be inferential. While it is true that from our vantage point of philological

knowledge (ἀπ)όλλυμι may appear to be a more precise rendition of ττω than does ταλαιπωρέω, it is difficult to know how an ancient scribe would have viewed the matter. Even though a modern critic may not approve the equivalence ταλαιπωρ- / ττω, yet it does enjoy a broad based support in the LXX (Ps 11(12):5, 16(17):9, 136(137):8, Job 5:21, Hos 9:6, 10:2, Am 3:10, 5:9, Mi 2:4(2x), Joel 1:10(2x), 15, Hab 1:3, 2:17, Zech 11:2, 3(2x), Is 16:4, 33:1, Ez 45:9), even being employed freely by Aquila (Jer 4:20, 29:11(49:10), 30:6(49:28); cf. also ταλαίπωρος / ττω 4:30). In the light of these facts it seems to us a moot point whether (ἀπ)όλλυμι and ὄλεθρος in Jer b' can truly be accounted for as a "more precise" revision in that part of the book; even if the point were granted that the rendition is "more precise" we have no way of knowing whether this was due to a translator or a reviser.

29(47):6 μάχηρα (IV 22, p. 102)

ἡ μάχαιρα τοῦ κυρίου . הוי חרב ליהוה

The common Heb noun **גִּר** is rendered in Jer as follows:²²

	Jer a'	Jer b'	Totals
μάχαιρα	36	14	50
ρόμφαία	2	12	14

Since μάκαρα is predominant in Jer a' while in Jer b' it is employed approximately only in half of the possible verses, Tov believes we may therefore assume that "in some instances Jer-R replaced μάκαρα with ῥομφαία ". No translation Tendenz is attributed to this presumed replacement, the example being one of the "synonymous renditions" of Ch. IV.

While it is true that in the LXX as a whole $\rho\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is marginally more frequent than $\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\rho\alpha$ ²³ (as opposed to

the predominance of μάχαιρα in Jer), comparison with other units shows that the distribution patterns of μάχαιρα / ῥομφαία in Jer is by ^{no} means peculiar. For instance, in the Hexateuch בָּרַח is translated 29 times by μάχαιρα²⁴ and 9 times by ῥομφαία, a ratio almost identical to that of Jer (50 : 14). The near-even split in Jer b' between μάχαιρα and ῥομφαία is paralleled in Ez by the 38 occurrences of μάχαιρα versus the 36 occurrences of ῥομφαία.²⁵ In short, it seems very dubious whether we can conclude anything with regard either to translators or revisers in Jer on the basis of frequency statistics of μάχαιρα and ῥομφαία; the comparative data in the rest of the LXX makes the distribution of the two synonyms in Jer appear quite normal (even Aquila seems to have vacillated in the use of μάχαιρα and ῥομφαία as renditions of בָּרַח , cf. Reider-Turner, pp. 152-3 and 211).

29(47):7 ἐντέλλομαι (IV 23, p. 102)

καὶ κύριος ἐνετείλατο αὐτῇ וַיִּצַח יְהוָה

The Heb verb וַיִּצַח is rendered in LXX Jer as follows:²⁶

	Jer a'	Jer b'
ἐντέλλομαι	16	11
συντάσσω	--	8

According to Tov's explanation of the above statistics, ἐντέλλομαι was changed to συντάσσω in Jer b' 8 times, while the 11 occurrences of ἐντέλλομαι in Jer b' constitute "an unrevised remnant of the OG of that section".

It is odd, however, that the "unrevised remnant" (11x) is larger than the revised portion (8x). Also, Tov's comment that συντάσσω does not "frequently render וַיִּצַח in any other part of the LXX except Ex and Num" is not quite correct. In addition to Ex and Num it regularly occurs in Lev and Josh,

occasionally in Gen, Deut and a few other books. Furthermore, of those Heb roots which συντάσσω translates, נִסַּח is by far the most common, only sporadic instances of other equivalents being found. Finally, it must be pointed out again that the interchange of ἐντέλλομαι and συντάσσω as found in Jer b' is not at all unique to that portion. If once more we take the Hexateuch as a comparative base we note that the two synonyms are used indiscriminately there in the ratio 191:74, with which the ratio of 11:8 in Jer b' may be compared. In conclusion, the usage of ἐντέλλομαι and συντάσσω in Jer b' need not signify the intervention of a reviser; it may quite readily be explained by the "synonymous renditions" of a single translator.

29:9(49:8) χρόνος (III 10, p. 51)

ἡγαγον ἐπ' αὐτόν	הבאתו י' ע' י' י'
<u>ἐν χρόνῳ</u> ᾧ ἐπισκεψάμην ἐπ' αὐτόν	וְהָיָה כִּי יָבֹאוּ

As is well known, Gk has two words for expressing "time", καῖρός and χρόνος, of which it is usually said that the former has the connotation of "decisive time" or "opportunity" whereas the latter has to do with "chronological" time. In the LXX of Jer καῖρός is found exclusively in Jer a' (29 times) while χρόνος is limited to Jer b' (4 times). The Heb word behind these translations is usually נָסַח²⁷ (26 times in Jer a', 3 times in Jer b'), the equivalence χρόνος / נָסַח being unique to Jer b' in the LXX (though it is also found in the versions of Aquila and Symmachus at Jer 37(30):7 and in the O text of Esth 5:13).

Tov thinks that καῖρός was revised by Jer-R to χρόνος as a less ambiguous translation of נָסַח. However, in a special study devoted to the subject of biblical words for time,²⁸ James Barr has argued that the traditional distinction that has been made in biblical Gk between καῖρός as denoting

"opportunity" and χρόνος as denoting "chronological" time is open to serious question. With regard to the LXX Barr shows that such a hard and fast distinction simply does not correspond to the facts. In Jer 45(38):28, for instance, Barr points out that we might have expected the translation καὶρός according to the traditional way of understanding the difference between καὶρός and χρόνος.²⁹ What is "ambiguous" in this discussion, therefore, is the question whether χρόνος in Jer b' could legitimately be considered a revisional feature intended to represent the Heb more precisely. The division between καὶρός and χρόνος in Jer b' stands fast; what remains unexplained is the source of this division.

29:11(49:10) ἐπίχειρον (III 4, pp. 48-49)

ὤλοντο διὰ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ

וַיָּחַדּוּ בְּיָדוֹ יָדָיו

διὰ χεῖρα] ἐπίχειρα Rudolph, Ziegler

Throughout the LXX the Heb word בְּיָדוֹ is regularly rendered by βραχίον . This equivalence is also found in LXX Jer at 17:5, 21:5 (Jer a') and 39(32):17,21 (Jer b'). Twice, however, the unusual word ἐπίχειρον --nowhere else attested in Gk literature³⁰--is used in Jer b' to translate בְּיָדוֹ (31(48):5, 34:4(27:5)). According to Rudolph and Ziegler the MS reading διὰ χεῖρα at 29:8 should be emended to ἐπίχειρα (the Gk translator having misread בְּיָדוֹ for בְּיָדָיו), thus giving three instances of this word in Jer b' (for a discussion of the emendation in 29:8 see above, pp. 167-170).

Tov's explanation for the appearance of ἐπίχειρον in Jer b' is that Jer-R apparently considered this word--possibly coined by him--a more precise rendition of בְּיָדוֹ than βραχίον , although he left the latter twice unrevised. From any point of view ἐπίχειρον is a strange translation of בְּיָדוֹ , but whether it is to be attributed to a reviser or translator cannot be decided on the basis of the available MS evidence. One might

wonder why a conscientious reviser at 29:11 would not have made a thoroughgoing revision; after all, the Heb says nothing about "arm" (יָד) at all, but speaks only of "seed" (זָרַע).

29:14(49:13) λέγει κύριος (III 43, pp. 69-70)

λέγει κύριος

יְהוָה

Closely related to the translation of the messenger formula יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ (see above, pp. 189 - 191) is that of the concluding formulas³¹ יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ and יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ, the former of which is particularly abundant in Jer (175 times). Here the differences between the two halves of Jer are not as marked as in the case of the יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ formula, but certain significant patterns still emerge. The statistics for the translations of יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ are as follows:³²

	Jer a'	Jer b'
<u>λέγει κύριος</u>	75	4
<u>φησὶ</u> "	--	23
<u>εἶπε</u> "	2	6

As in the case of the introductory formulas τάδε λέγει κύριος and οὕτως εἶπε κύριος, so here the MS evidence is again reasonably stable though variants do exist in sundry MSS, but not so as to put many readings in doubt.³³

Clearly the overwhelming preference in Jer a' is for the form λέγει κύριος (also the standard phrase employed throughout the LXX), while the most popular rendition in Jer b' is φησὶ κύριος (found elsewhere only in 1 Re 2:30, 4 Re 9:26, and 2 Chr 34:27). The alternate concluding formula יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ is rendered in Jer by εἶπε κύριος only, once in Jer a' (6:15) and 6 times in Jer b' (29:19, 31:8, 37:3, 40:11, 13, 51:26).

Tov interprets these facts as fitting the formula, "Gk 1 (= Heb 1 + Heb 2) in Jer a' versus Gk 1 (= Heb 1) and Gk 2

(= Heb 2) in Jer b'", which in effect means that "Jer-OG used one Greek word to render two different Hebrew words, while Jer-R tended to employ two different Greek words". In terms of the expressions יהוה אלהים and יהוה אחד this means that whereas Jer a' tended to use one word only, λέγει, to render both אלהים and אחד, Jer b'--along with the Three, O and L--preferred to distinguish between אלהים and אחד using φησί for the former and εἶπε for the latter.

However, there are some serious exceptions to the rule. In addition to the 4 instances of λέγει κύριος; which were presumably left unrevised in Jer b', there are also the 6 occurrences of εἶπε κύριος; as translations of יהוה אלהים in the same part; these have to be explained either as remnants of the OG in Jer b' (contrary, however, to Jer-OG's regular policy of using λέγει), as representing Heb variants יהוה אחד where MT has יהוה אלהים, or as being Jer b's own rendition (again contrary to his normal procedure and undermining the validity of the revisional policy which Tov has discerned in the data).³⁴ The variety of translation equivalents for יהוה אלהים in Jer b' is indeed a problem on any accounting, whether by reviser or second translator, but it is difficult to see how the data on hand can help to make a definitive choice between the two theories. The many exceptions to the rule make the suggestion of a revisional distinction between אלהים and אחד extremely vulnerable, but even granting the existence of such an attempted distinction the MS evidence does not inform us about its source.

29:14(49:13) ἀβατοῖς (III 1, pp. 46-47)

εἰς ἀβατον

לשם

The Heb words לשם and לשם are represented in LXX Jer as follows:³⁵

	Jer a'	Jer b'
ἀφανισμός	18	-
ἄβατος	3	10
ἔρημος	2	1
ἐρήμωσις	1	-
ἐκστασις	1	-
ἀπορία	1	-
ἀπώλεια	-	2

Similarly we have the translations of the verb D H W :36

	Jer a'	Jer b'
ἀφανίζω	2	-
ἀβατόω	-	1
ἐρημόω	1	1
ἐξίστημι	3	-
σκυθρωπάζω	2	-

As can be seen, the most frequent translation of $\text{H H W} / \text{H H H W}$ in Jer a' is ἀφανισμός, while in Jer b' ἄβατος predominates (cf. also the verb equivalents ἀφανίζω / D H W in Jer a' and ἀβατόω / D H W in Jer b'). Tov interprets this data to mean that "ἀφανισμός ('the act of destroying') has been replaced by Jer-R with ἄβατος (literally "untrodden") because the former does not precisely represent the Heb", the reviser even having gone so far as to innovate the verb ἀβατόω on the model of ἐρημόω.

It may fairly be said that there is a marked division of usage between Jer a' and Jer b' in the occurrences of ἀφανισμός and ἄβατος, the former being characteristic of Jer a' while the latter predominates in Jer b', though there is some overlap in the case of ἄβατος since it is found not only as a translation of $\text{H H W} / \text{H H H W}$ in Jer a' but also of H H W and H H W (2:6 and 28(51):43 respectively). The interpretation to be placed on these facts, however, remains debatable. There is the difficulty first in determining whether ἄβατος

really does represent the Heb more precisely than does ἀφανισμός (the latter is widely employed in the LXX for נָחַשׁ / נָחַשׁ , as well as in the literal translation of Aquila; ἄβατος was used by Aquila to translate נָחַשׁ³⁷). And as always, there is in the nature of the evidence no way of knowing whether the choice of vocabulary equivalents derives from a reviser or an independent translator.

29:17(49:16) καταλύω (IV 2, p. 94)

ἰταμία καρδίας σου יְדִין לְבָבְךָ
κατέλυσεν τρυμαλῖας πετρῶν שָׁכַן בְּהַגְוִי הַסֵּלַע

The verb יָכַשׁ is translated in LXX Jer as follows:³⁸

	Jer a'	Jer b'
κατασκηνόω	4	-
καταλύω	-	3
κατοικίζω	2	-
οικέω	-	1

The preference for the equivalence καταλύω / יָכַשׁ in Jer b' as opposed to κατασκηνόω / יָכַשׁ in Jer a' is cited by Tov as another example of the reviser replacing an original translation with a "synonymous rendition". Since, however,

יָכַשׁ was also rendered in Jer a' by κατοικίζω (2x) and in Jer b' by οικέω (1x), there is no way of affirming that the original translation at 29:17, 30:9, and 32:10 must have been κατασκηνόω rather than something else. Also it should be borne in mind that while the verb κατασκηνόω does not appear in Jer b', καταλύω does occur four times in Jer a' (translating three different Heb verbs), so that Tov's comment that "Jer-R apparently cherished the root καταλυ-" is not entirely fair--it is not exclusive to Jer b'. It is true, as Tov observes, that in the LXX the equivalence καταλύω / יָכַשׁ is "more rare" than κατασκηνόω / יָכַשׁ (καταλύω / יָכַשׁ

is found elsewhere only four times in Sir while κατασκηνοῶ /
 170 occurs outside Jer 41 times), but this in itself does not
 bear witness either to a reviser or to a second translator.³⁹

<u>29:20(49:19)</u>	<u>τόπος</u>	(III 48, pp. 73-74)
<u>29:21(49:20)</u>	<u>κατάλυσσις</u>	(" ")

εἰς τόπον Αἰθῶν

לֵב נֹחַ וְנֹחַ

ἐν γῇ ἀβατοθῇ
 ἐπ' αὐτὴν κατάλυσσις αὐτῶν

לֵב נֹחַ וְנֹחַ
לֵב נֹחַ וְנֹחַ

In section I of this chapter we have already looked at two words from 29:20(49:19) which Tov cites as "distinctive similarities" in Jer a' and b' (ἐκδιώκω and ἐνθρόνισμι pp.185-187 above). It was pointed out there that 29:20(49:19) forms a parallel passage to 27(50):44, the corresponding verses being quoted in full. We noted the remarkable similarities between the two verses, both in Heb and Gk, and commented briefly upon their possible significance. In the present section we note the differences between the two parallel verses, observing further that the parallel passage extends through to v. 22(21) in the Edom oracle and v. 46 in the Babylon oracle.⁴⁰ Our starting point is the translation of נֹחַ (נֹחַ / נֹחַ), regularly rendered by νομή in Jer a' but in Jer b' represented by τόπος, κατάλυσσις, and κατάλυμα. In tabular form the relevant statistics are as follows:⁴¹

	Jer a'	Jer b'
νομή	6	-
τόπος	-	2
κατάλυσσις	-	1
κατάλυμα	-	1

The preference for νομή in Jer a' is further reinforced by the use of the same word to translate נִימָה twice (10:21, 23:1), while Jer b' uses yet another translation option, βόσκημα, (32:22(25:36)) for that word. On the basis of these statistics Tov argues that the reviser not only chose vocabulary options different from those of the original translator, but also distinguished between two different meanings of נִימָה : "habitation" τόπος ; "abode" and "pasture"-- κατάλυσις, and κατάλυμα .

Whether Jer b' intended to distinguish different meanings of נִימָה in the way Tov describes it may or may not be so, but what must be emphasized again is the fact that the example as such does not help us choose between a reviser and translator. If the different vocabulary choices of Jer b' represent genuine attempts to distinguish between different meanings of one and the same Heb morpheme, this may have been attempted by an original translator no less than a reviser.

29:20(49:19) κατὰ πρόσωπον (III 22, p. 59)

καὶ τίς οὗτος ποιμήν
ὃς στήσεται κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου

וְהִנֵּה זֶה רֹעֶה
אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמִיד לִפְנֵי

If we look back at the parallel passage 29:20(49:19) // 27(50):44 quoted on p. 185, we discover that the Heb and Gk phrase cited above is reproduced verbatim in the parallel passage of the Babylon oracle, including the phrase κατὰ πρόσωπον . Yet when we take into account the translation pattern for לִפְנֵי in the whole of LXX Jer, the following picture obtains:⁴²

	Jer a'	Jer b'
κατὰ πρόσωπον	5	17
πρὸ πρόσωπον	4	-
εἰς πρόσωπον	-	1
ἐναντίον	6	1
ἐνώπιον	1	-
πρότερος	-	3

With these facts in mind Tov concludes that, "Contrary to Jer-OG, Jer-R for the most part rendered יָפַל as κατὰ πρόσωπον, which faithfully represents the two components of the Heb". He also notes that in the translation of other similar Heb words and expressions, Jer b' tends to prefer a more literal rendition where Jer a' employs standard Gk such as ἐναντίον or ἐνώπιον (cf. יָפַל III 21, p. 59; -לָ נָפַת III 27, pp. 61-62). While there is no doubting the literal character of the Gk phrase with πρόσωπον, as opposed to the more natural Gk rendition with ἐναντίον, it is also true, as recognized by Tov, that all renditions cited for Jer occur passim in the LXX. In fact, the literal translations κατὰ πρόσωπον and πρὸ πρόσωπον outnumber the more natural renditions 9 : 7 even in Jer a'. It is therefore not at all certain that the use of κατὰ (εἰς) πρόσωπον in Jer b' should be interpreted as the work of a reviser.

29:22(49:21) φοβέομαι

(IV 24, p. 102)

ὅτι ἀπὸ φωνῆς πτώσεως αὐτῶν
ἐφοβήθη ἡ γῆ

הָקוֹל נָפַל
רָעַשָׁה הָאָרֶץ

The parallel passages found in 29:20-22(49:19-21) and 27(50):44-46 are by all accounts an enigma in the LXX. Up to the middle of v. 21(20) // v. 45 the Gk and Heb match one another almost word for word; but all of a sudden in the middle of that verse the spell is broken and we are left with a number of intriguing translation differences as well as differences in the two Heb accounts. These differences may be clearly observed when the two portions are reproduced side by side:

29:21-22(49:20-21)

διὰ τοῦτο ἀκούσατε βουλὴν κυρίου
יהוה תשמעו נא

ἣν ἐβουλεύσατο ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν
אשר יצא לה

καὶ λογισμὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃν ἐλογίσατο
אשר חשב בלבו

ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ^④Χαιμαν
אשר יושב חמאן

Ἐὰν μὴ ^①συμφησθῶσι τὰ
^②ἐλάχιστα τῶν προβάτων
אם לא יסכימו
במיעוט הצאן

Ἐὰν μὴ ^③ἀβιωθῇ ἐπ' αὐτήν
^④κατάλυσιν αὐτῶν
אם לא ימות
עליונות הצאן

v. 22 (21)

ὅτι ἀπὸ φωνῆς πτώσεως αὐτῶν
אשר יהיה קול נפילה

^⑤ἐφοβήθη ἡ γῆ
אשר יפחד
הארץ

καὶ κραυγὴ θαλάσσης οὐκ (ἐν
θαλάσῃ Σουφ-Ζιελ) ἠκούσθη
אשר תשמע
קול ים וקול

27(50):45-46

διὰ τοῦτο ἀκούσατε τὴν βουλὴν κυρίου
יהוה תשמעו נא

ἣν βεβούλευται ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα
אשר יצא לה

καὶ λογισμοὺς αὐτοῦ οὓς ἐλογίσατο
אשר חשב בלבו

ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Χαλδαίους
אשר יושב כדן

Ἐὰν μὴ ^①διαφθαρῇ τὰ ^②ἀρνία
τῶν προβάτων αὐτῶν
אם לא יפגע
בצאן הצאן

Ἐὰν μὴ ^③ἀφανισθῇ ^④νομή ἀπ'
αὐτῶν
אם לא יפגע
במנהג הצאן

v. 46

ὅτι ἀπὸ φωνῆς ἀλώσεως Βαβυλῶνος
אשר יהיה קול חורבן

^⑤σεισθήσεται ἡ γῆ
אשר ירט
הארץ

καὶ κραυγὴ ἐν ἔθνεσιν
ἀκουσθήσεται

אשר תשמע
בגוים קול

Of the five translation equivalents which are different in the above parallel passages, Tov comments on three (#3, #4, and #5). The equivalence $\sigma\sigma\mu\psi\acute{\alpha}\omega$ / $\beth\pi\sigma$ (#1), Tov discusses as an example of the "distinctive similarities" between Jer a' and b' (see above p. 187), but does not mention the different translation $\delta\iota\alpha\phi\epsilon\acute{\rho}\omega$ of Jer a' at 27(50):45. Nor does he anywhere discuss the different translations $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$ / $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\rho\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\rho\omicron\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ for עֲרִיבֵי הַצֶּמַח (it is interesting to observe that in the latter case it is Jer a' which employs the more literal translation, the choice of Jer b' apparently being influenced by the context).

With regard to the different translations $\phi\omicron\beta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha$ and $\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$ of שָׁרַר ,⁴³ Tov lists these as another example of "synonymous renditions" in Jer a' and b'. But only by considerably stretching the meaning of "synonymous" can one regard these as equally suitable translations of שָׁרַר , $\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$ definitely being the preferred choice. Why a reviser would want to change what was already a literal and natural translation to a decidedly more ambiguous translation remains unanswered.

29:23(49:22) $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ (III 51, p. 75)

$\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ וְהָיָה לֵב
 $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ גְּבוּרֵי אֲדָמָה

The renditions of גְּבוּרֵי found in LXX Jer are as follows:⁴⁴

	Jer a'	Jer b'
$\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$	4	3
$\mu\alpha\chi\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$	8	-
$\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$	-	3
$\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$	1	-

Tov observes that the main rendition of Jer a', *μαχητής*, does not represent the usual equivalent of the Heb word in the LXX; he suggests that the reviser preferred instead the two standard renditions of *ἰσχυρός* and *δυνατός*, presumably replacing any occurrence of *μαχητής* with these.

With the aid of HP and dos Santos we can substantiate the following with regard to the translation of *גִּבּוֹר* in the LXX:

-- *ἰσχυρός* is found distributed more or less evenly throughout the LXX (23x);

-- *μαχητής* renders *גִּבּוֹר* 18 times in the LXX; but apart from one occurrence in the text of Jud and one in 1 Chr, the rendition is confined to the MP and Jer a' (cf. Tov VI 7, p. 137);

-- *δυνατός* is the most popular translation equivalence of all (78x), especially in the historical books from Josh onwards, but seldom found in the prophets;

-- *ἀνὴρ* is one of several miscellaneous translations of *גִּבּוֹר* found throughout the LXX.

It is true, therefore, as Tov says that "*μαχητής* does not represent the usual equivalent of the Heb word in the LXX" and that the more common renditions are *ἰσχυρός* and *δυνατός*. But we are unable to proceed with the same confidence as Tov does to the conclusion that therefore Jer b' must have eliminated any occurrences of *μαχητής* replacing them with *ἰσχυρός* or *δυνατός*. To us it seems that the kind of statistics cited are not of the order that could establish such a proposition.

III. Conclusions

In this section we wish to summarize and to evaluate the success of Tov's challenge to the multiple translator theory for the book of Jer. The foregoing discussion based on material provided by the oracles against the Philistines and Edom has already indicated some of the problem areas in the interpretation of the data; here we will deal in more general terms with methodological considerations and relative merits of the conclusions reached.

In the absence of any kind of external or explicit MS evidence testifying either to the intervention of a second translator or reviser at Jer 29 it is recognized by all that our conclusions on these matters must be inferential. These inferences are based primarily on observations of data provided by a lexicostatistical analysis of translation equivalents throughout the book. Both Thackeray and Tov proceed with essentially this same methodology and both agree at the outset that the documented change of style and vocabulary equivalents in the middle of the book testify against its unity as it now stands and requires some other explanation. This conviction regarding the composite nature of the book is itself, of course, an inference based on the assumption of consistency in the style and vocabulary choices of a single translator. In introducing his JTS article on "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah" (p. 245), Thackeray recognized a potential danger in employing the criterion of translation variants as an argument against the unity of a prescribed piece. It is namely true that the translators for the most part did not rigidly render each Heb word by a single Gk equivalent but deliberately varied their vocabulary choices with the result that renditions sometimes differ in the same book and even in the same context without any change of translator being involved. The key to the detection of a different hand, therefore, must be the degree of consistency with which the same Heb word was rendered in different parts of the same work. If we find that the same Heb word is rendered "with fair consistency" in one way

in one part of a book and in another way in another part, then, according to Thackeray, we are justified in suspecting its unity. As far as assumptions go, this seems as reasonable as any, but it should still be recognized for what it is, namely, an assumption.

On Thackeray's terms, evidence for a lack of unity was equivalent to evidence for a second translator. Having discovered 28 examples of Heb words (or syntactical constructions) which met with his standard of "a fair consistency" of different rendition in the two parts of the book, this led him automatically to a multiple translator theory for the book. The only other explanation which might conceivably account for the facts, he reasoned, was that of Hexaplaric influence (pp. 245, 252). Since the words in Jer a' generally have some Hexaplaric support whereas those in Jer b' do not, it could be argued that the Gk text had been revised or corrupted up to a certain point by the Hexapla. But finding this explanation untenable he was left with (to him) the only alternative solution of a multiple translator theory.

Employing the same methodology and criterion of translation consistency, Tov has added to the examples adduced by Thackeray but has sought to interpret the data somewhat differently by postulating the intervention of a pre-Hexaplaric reviser. It is interesting to note that although Tov nowhere makes reference to Thackeray's brief consideration of a reviser explanation, the possibility of such had not escaped Thackeray's notice--albeit Thackeray could only conceive of a post-Hexaplaric revision. Living as we do in the "post-Barthélemy" era, it is only natural that somebody should explore the idea of a pre-Hexaplaric revision to account for the peculiar distribution of translation equivalents in Jer. To do this, as we have seen, Tov emphasizes the similarities between the two parts of Jer.

In taking this approach, it can be argued that Tov is again following the same methodology pursued by Thackeray elsewhere, viz. in his identification of the translator of Jer b' with that of Bar 1:1-3:8. However, the difficulty experienced by Thackeray in making up his mind of the significance of the similarities

between Jer b' and Bar 1:1-3:8 ought to give pause with regard to pronouncing final judgement on the significance of the relationship between Jer a' and b'. Thackeray's vacillation on this matter can be appreciated from the following account of his changing views. In the original JTS article Thackeray noted that others had previously observed the similarities between Jer and Bar, the only question being whether this was due to identity of translators or to imitation (p. 262); his own investigation of the evidence, however, led him to the conclusion that the similarities could admit of but one solution, namely that the translator of Bar is identical with the second portion of Jer (p. 265). But some years later he abandoned this view and now argued that the similarities in the first part of Bar to the style of the second translator of Jer must be due to a close imitation of his style since the observed phenomena were insufficient to prove translation by one and the same man (Jewish Worship, p. 87). Yet later again, when he returned to the subject in his contribution on Bar in a New Commentary on Holy Scripture (1929), Thackeray reverted to his original position to the effect that imitation would not account for all the similarities but pointed instead to identity of hands (p. 105).

With regard to the two parts of Jer, however, Thackeray never experienced any of the above vacillation on the interpretation of the data. He was indeed aware of some of the similarities between Jer a' and b', including several of the words discussed above, e.g. ἱταμία, συμπάω, τρυμαλία (Gr. Trans. Jer., pp. 253-254), παντοκράτωρ (Jewish Worship, p. 33), but was able to accommodate these to his multiple translator theory for Jer. In Tov's scheme, everything depends on the interpretation given to these similarities; for this reason his chapter on this subject (Ch. II) is absolutely fundamental as he himself recognizes in different places.⁴⁵ Conversely he also admits that his interpretation of the differences between Jer a' and b' as revisional is true only if his explanation of the similarities can be upheld;⁴⁶ in fact, not one of the chapters outside Ch. II on the similarities contributes anything toward the argument for the unity of the original translation.⁴⁷

The question then is what degree of persuasiveness is to be credited to Tov's chapter on the distinctive similarities between Jer a' and b'. In attempting to answer this question we need to consider two things: first, Tov's critique of Thackeray's explanation for the appearance of the similarities, and secondly, the strength of his own examples adduced in favour of a unity of translation.

Tov summarizes Thackeray's explanations as follows (p. 20):

- (a) Jer.^b imitated Jer.^a ("Gr. Trans. Jer.", 253-4);
- (b) Later redactors or scribes were responsible for "a certain amount of mixture of the two styles" (ib., 254);
- (c) The similarities resulted from "imperfect collaboration of two workers, the second of whom only partially followed the lead of the first" (The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, 35).

With regard to these explanations Tov makes a number of observations which may be paraphrased as follows:

1. Would a second translator possess the recall capacity to employ Jer a''s translation equivalents without the use of a Heb-Gk and Gk-Heb concordance?

2. Some of the similarities cannot be explained by any of Thackeray's explanations. For instance, 10 of the rare Gk words common to both parts reflect translations of more than one Heb word. Tov feels that there is no reason why anyone would copy a certain rare Gk word (reflecting a given Heb 1) from one section to the other as a representation of a different Heb word (Heb 2).

3. It is a priori more likely that differences were inserted secondarily rather than similarities; otherwise how would one explain the far greater proportion of remaining differences?

4. The phrase "a mixture of the two styles" to describe Jer a' and b' is ill-chosen since the observed correspondences do not represent characteristic features of the "style" of either Jer a' or b' but constitute rather isolated instances of agreement

in rare words and renditions.

5. The suggestion that a given translator imitated the vocabulary of a colleague has no parallel in the LXX, except perhaps in the case of borrowing from the Pentateuch which, however, represents a different Sitz im Leben.

6. The assumption of redactors who welded together the two portions of Jer is unconvincing since there is no proof for the existence of such redactors, and even if they had existed they would probably have chosen to erase more obvious differences.

7. The need for "collaboration" between a pair of translators would have arisen only in case of lexical difficulties, an explanation which could apply only to a few of the examples given.

Undoubtedly some of the above points are valuable observations and need to be given their due consideration; yet counter-arguments exist for most:

1. It is extremely difficult for us to judge what the recall factor of an ancient scribe might or might not have been. It is common knowledge that memory retention in antiquity far surpassed anything considered normal today.⁴⁸

2. Why Jer b' sometimes employs a rare Gk word to translate a Heb word different from that which it renders in Jer a' is problematic, but not fatal, especially since the LXX provides abundant examples of the most surprising and unexpected equivalents, as almost any page of HR or dos Santos will show. Being conditioned to expect great diversity in translation variants, the "shock value" of some unique equivalents is considerably minimized.

3. Thackeray never claimed that the two halves of Jer were submitted to a thoroughgoing revision to bring the two halves into conformity with each other. What he did say was that the joint had "ragged edges" and that a concentration of similarities to the vocabulary of Jer a' exists in the first three chapters of Jer b' ("Gr. Trans. Jer.", p. 253).

4. Thackeray's phrase "a mixture of the two styles" is not to be pressed. From the context it is clear that he was using the word "style" in a loose sense rather than as a description of "characteristic features" of Jer a' or b'. The phrase as such occurs in the context of Thackeray's discussion concerning the observed correspondences between Jer a' and Chs. 29-31 of Jer b'; some of the examples cited, in fact, include "the rare renditions and words" to which Tov has called attention.

5. Is it really true that a given translator imitating the vocabulary of a colleague has no parallel in the LXX? Recent work on "Intra-Septuagintal Borrowing" suggests that imitation may have been undertaken on a scale far larger than hitherto realized.⁴⁹

6. The complaint that there is no proof for the existence of redactors who welded together Jer a' and b' seems out of place in a work which depends entirely for its persuasiveness on the assumption of an unknown reviser who reworked Jer b'.

7. Why collaboration between translators need be limited only to Heb words which caused lexical difficulties is not clear to us. If collaboration or cross-consultation did exist it is surely a rash undertaking to pronounce on its possible limits.

We are not persuaded, therefore, that Tov's criticisms definitively undermine the possibility of multiple translator theory for the book of Jer. But an equally important test is detailed evaluation of the "distinctive similarities" brought forward by Tov in defense of the unity theory. In the first part of this chapter we have analysed 12 of the 45 examples listed by Tov and found the arguments on their behalf by no means invincible. Tov has suggested that perhaps because Thackeray recognized only a small number of the similarities he was inclined to accord them a secondary status (p. 20). But it seems to us that simply a few more of the same type of agreements as represented by Jer 29 is insufficient evidence to bear the weight of the unity theory. For, as repeatedly pointed out in the second part of our chapter, the observed differences between Jer a' and b', including the various types of Tendenz ascertained

within them by Tov, can be explained as readily on the assumption of a second translator as that of a reviser. In fact, it seems to us that a more natural and less forced reading of the evidence inclines in favour of the former.

We need finally to consider Tov's explanation of how it happens that we have extant only the revised portion of Jer b' rather than that of the whole book. The theory, we recall, is that the original work of revision covered the whole of the text, probably effected on two different scrolls. Sometime between the original translation and the writing of our present MSS a mistake was made in the selection of scrolls for the text that was to become standard for all subsequent re-copyings. For some reason, a scroll containing the first half of the text-type represented by Jer a' was combined with one of the type represented by Jer b', and this combination became the archetype of the present text of Jer. This explanation further entails the presupposition that the dividing line in both text types occurred at the same point. Tov himself describes the proposed solution as "irrational" (p. 162), but finds no other explanation except the less likely one that the reviser commenced his work with Jer 29.

While Tov's proposed scenario of an accidental combination of two scrolls of different text-types, one from the original translation and one from a revised edition, is not inconceivable, especially in the light of our knowledge concerning ancient Buchwesen and also in the light of changes in text types in the same book (e.g. Reigns) or individual MSS (e.g. 130 in Jer), neither does it appear to have anything more to commend it than an original division of labour among two different translators. Certainly Tov's well documented footnote (n. 22, p. 173) affirming the ancient practice of dividing large units into different scrolls does not support his theory any more than it does Thackeray's; in fact, he includes the latter's JTS article "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS" among his list of references.

But what strikes us as particularly damaging to the reviser theory is the lack of any surviving MS evidence either from the

presumed revised a' portion or from the hypothetically unrevised b' portion. Were all surviving copies of the former scrolls so completely obliterated as to leave no trace in the extant MS collection? In an appendix to Tov's original thesis (pp. 202-208) he did indeed discuss the possibility of vestiges of the revised and unrevised portions of Jer a' and b' respectively among some of the existing MS variants (e.g. 29:22 $\epsilon\phi\omicron\beta\eta'\theta\eta$ B-S-538] $\epsilon\sigma(\epsilon)\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ rel., p. 205), but in the published version of the thesis (n. 17, p. 172), he admits that none of the examples is conclusive since all have alternate explanations (e.g. in the case of $\epsilon\sigma(\epsilon)\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ in 29:22 this word is undoubtedly a revision in A Q V O L C; cf. Ziegler's remark, "29:22 ist $\epsilon\phi\omicron\beta\eta'\theta\eta$ als ursprünglich in der Text aufzunehmen....Es ist undenkbar, dass der B-Text die gewöhnliche Wendung $\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ ἡ γῆ durch $\epsilon\phi\omicron\beta\eta'\theta\eta$ ἡ γῆ ersetzt hätte", Ieremias, p. 45).

In short, we are not persuaded that the last word has been said on the multiple translator theory of Jer. Tov has indeed pointed out some problem areas underlying this explanation, and, given the unity hypothesis, he has effectively taken the available evidence as far as it will go. The question is whether it will go far enough to overturn the two-translator theory.⁵⁰ It is true that in current LXX studies the fashion is to look for Gk revisions on the basis of a changing Heb Vorlage, and while much points to the genuine survival of such revisions (e.g. Kaige), it does not seem to us that the lexical phenomena presented by the book of Jer are of the same order.⁵¹ For the present, therefore, it seems safest to proceed with the assumption that our extant archetype text of Jer b' represents an original translation rather than a revision. If more hardcore evidence is forthcoming, the case for a revision can be re-examined, but in the absence of such evidence, the notion of a lost revised text of Jer a' and of a prior unrevised stage of Jer b' must remain mere speculation.

CHAPTER 5

THE GREEK/HEBREW PROBLEM: A CRITIQUE OF J.G. JANZEN'S STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO TEXTS OF JEREMIAH

In this chapter we turn from the consideration of inner-Gk problems to an analysis of the relationship between the Gk and Heb texts of the book of Jer. A subject of much debate, the differences between the two texts in terms of length and arrangement have usually been explained according to one of four broad theories as outlined in the Introduction (pp. 11-12 above): the "abbreviation" theory, the "editorial" theory, the "expansion" theory, and the "mediating" theory. In a Harvard thesis published in 1973 under the title Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, J. Gerald Janzen has vigorously challenged both the theory of a deliberately abbreviated Gk translation as well as the scholarly consensus of the mediating position which holds that in cases where the LXX and MT differ, a decision on the "better" reading can be reached only case by case and may not be determined deductively by an appeal to generalizations. Influenced by the Qumran discoveries, some of which include fragments from the book of Jer, Janzen has instead defended the integrity of the Heb Vorlage underlying the LXX over against that of the MT which is consequently viewed as a later expansion of the original writings.

The last chapter of our thesis provides the necessary forum for a constructive critique of Janzen's book. Our procedure will be first of all to examine Janzen's statements on the purpose, scope, and motivation of the study as set forth in his Introduction. These matters have a significant bearing on the way Janzen's study is prosecuted as well as on the results achieved, and must therefore be carefully evaluated. This section is then followed by a detailed analysis of the author's handling of the differences ("zero variants") between the LXX and MT texts as

illustrated in the oracles against the Philistines and Edom and related passages. A last section draws together the results of our investigation and seeks realistically to assess the limits of our present understanding as to how the two texts relate to each other. The basic outline for the chapter, therefore, will be as follows:

- I. Critique of Janzen's "Introduction"
- II. Critique of Janzen's Explanation of the "Zero Variants" in the Oracles Against the Philistines and Edom
- III. Conclusions

I. Critique of Janzen's "Introduction"

In this section we shall look in turn at three points discussed in the book's introductory chapter: A) The Purpose and Scope of Janzen's Study, B) The Justification for Janzen's Study, and C) The Leading Questions Underlying Janzen's Study.

A. The Purpose and Scope of Janzen's Study

The purpose of Janzen's study as explained on page one of the book is to re-open the debate on the radical divergence in length between the Massoretic and LXX texts of the book of Jer. The study is therefore limited to the matter of "omissions" or, as Janzen prefers to call them, "zero variants". The author recognizes the existence of other problem areas in the relationship between the two texts, e.g. qualitative or "content" variants, where the texts diverge not in length but in meaning, and transpositions, particularly those relating to the section of the Oracles Against the Foreign Nations; however, these matters are declared "not directly relevant" to the study and are consequently left to one side except for incidental comment.

Question: Is Janzen's limitation valid? i.e. Can "zero variants" legitimately be studied in isolation from "content variants" and other problem areas in the book without distorting

the evidence? It is easy to sympathize with the need for imposing some kinds of limits on the study of a book the size of Jer, and the limitation actually chosen by Janzen in favour of quantitative differences seems logical and defensible enough. However, acceptance of such a limitation should be clearly held in view throughout the investigation and be allowed to temper the finality of any conclusions reached. Janzen shows himself aware of this requirement in his opening statement of Ch. VIII when he says, "The limitation of this study to the zero variants makes possible only a partial assessment of the character of the texts of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{Q} . Full assessment will involve detailed examination of the content variants, and of the transpositions" (p. 121). However, we will want to ask whether sufficient notice has in fact been taken of this precaution throughout Janzen's study and whether the author has not indulged in more interpretation than is warranted by the self-imposed limits of the study. We hold that the value of a limited study such as that undertaken by Janzen lies more in its descriptive rather than in its interpretive side.

B. The Justification for Janzen's Study

Following a brief review of previous literature on the Gk/Heb problem of Jer (pp. 2-7), Janzen next discusses the appropriateness of reopening the question at this time (pp. 7-8). Three reasons are cited as justification for a new evaluation of the data: 1) The existence of improved Gk text-critical tools, 2) The discovery of new Heb MS evidence, and 3) The unsatisfactory character of the present-day approach to the text of Jer.

1. The Existence of Improved Gk Text-critical Tools

The text-critical tool referred to, which, according to Janzen, makes possible "a new level of precision" in the determination of the LXX text, is that of Ziegler's edition in the Göttingen series. As has been shown in Ch. 3 of the present thesis, Ziegler's text of Jer, while not faultless, is nevertheless an excellent one, and the best available edition of this book. Since a prior and

fundamental requirement for any definitive study on the relationship between the Gk and Heb texts is that of a reliable LXX text, we would agree that this need has largely been met in the Göttingen critical text and apparatus.¹

2. The Discovery of New Heb MS Evidence

The single most important factor which in Janzen's opinion necessitates a re-investigation of the two texts of Jer is the discovery of Qumran fragments of four MSS of Jer, especially 4QJer^b which in several variants agrees with the LXX against the MT. It would be useful at the outset, therefore, to have a clear account of exactly what new MS material is actually available.

The four MSS identified at Qumran to date are 2QJer, 4QJer^a, 4QJer^b, and 4QJer^c. Of these, only the fragments of 2QJer (27 in all, half of which are too small to be assigned a verse reference) have been published in the official series, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Vol. III, 1962; Plâches, Textes; ed. M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, R. de Vaux). The biblical material from Cave 4 has been notoriously slow in appearing in an editio princeps,² but a preliminary transcription of twelve fragments of 4QJer^a and three fragments of 4QJer^b can be found in Appendix D of Janzen's book (pp. 173-184). To my knowledge, none of the fragments of 4QJer^c has as yet been published in any form.

Of the four MSS named above, three attest a distinct MT-type text: 2QJer, 4QJer^a, and 4QJer^c.³ This leaves only the three small fragments from 4QJer^b which alone attest a text-type resembling that of the LXX.⁴ With regard to the significance of the latter MS Janzen contends that it "confirms the methodological validity of attempts to move from \varnothing by retroversion to its supposed Hebrew Vorlage" (p. 7), and secondly, that it calls in question the exegetical approach to LXX studies which has sought to explain divergencies between the Gk and Heb texts in terms of transmission technique or translator Tendenz (pp. 7-8). These two claims for the significance of 4QJer^b need to be carefully assessed.

We must ask, first, whether 4QJer^b really does validate the process of retroversion on the scale that Janzen envisages. The technique of retroversion, once in great vogue, has in recent times and for good reasons been practiced with much greater reserve. As Goshen-Gottstein has observed: "there is no retroversion without a residual of doubt, and what seems self-evident to one scholar may look like a house of cards to his fellow" ("Theory and Practice", p. 132). We are not suggesting, of course, that Janzen would approve of a return to the indiscriminate retroversion of former generations (cf. his remarks on Workman, p. 6), yet he does make considerable use of the technique in his book, so that very often the Gk is represented by Heb characters. Take, for example, Appendices A and B.2,4. Does 4QJer^b give us the confidence to assume that wherever the Gk has a shorter name or formula that this was translated from a Heb parent text exactly as found in Janzen's list? We believe that this is to expect too much. Janzen (p. 173) invites us to extrapolate from the extant fragments of 4QJer^b to a consideration of what the MS as a whole must have been like and then decide whether we are not convinced that this MS is emphatically, even if not perfectly, a witness to a shorter Heb text of the book of Jer. The programme is appealing and the solution apparently simple, yet who would dare say in any given instance exactly what 4QJer^b or any other MS may or may not have read?⁵ While we can appreciate the convenience of representing the Gk by Heb characters in the tables referred to, and elsewhere throughout the book, the "methodological validity" of so doing has not, in our opinion, been fully vindicated.

As for the exegetical approach to LXX studies of which Janzen is so critical, we do not think this can be dismissed quite as easily either. We would agree that "the time is past when one could approach the Greek text primarily as a source for learning the exegetical method of the translator" (emphasis ours), but this is quite different from ignoring such considerations altogether. As our subsequent critique will attempt to show, it is precisely this failure to take account of other factors besides those of length which constitutes one of the major weaknesses

of Janzen's work. To take an example not drawn from the Philistine or Edom oracle: Janzen argues at length (pp. 54-57) that the three occurrences of the word נָבִי with reference to Nebuchadrezzar (MT 25:9, 27:6, 43:10) are all secondary since in each case the LXX either omits the word in question or attests a different reading from the Heb (LXX 25:9, 34:5, 50:10). Yet the existence of other ways of interpreting the data, whether by emphasizing theological/philological aspects of the Heb or translation Tendenz in the Gk, have been amply demonstrated by T.W. Overholt (CBQ 30 (1968), 39-48; contra W.E. Lemke, CBQ 28 (1966), 45-50), Z. Zevit (JBL 88 (1969), 74-77), and D. Schmidt (IOSCS Bulletin 8 (1975), 17-18). The discovery of 4QJer^b does not give us license to disregard such exegetical and contextual considerations; their merits must be evaluated whether a shorter Heb text exists or not.

3. The Unsatisfactory Character of the Present-day Approach to the Text of Jer

According to Janzen, the problem with the twentieth century approach to the text of Jer has been the lack of any systematic treatment of the quantitative differences between the LXX and MT. Instead, scholars have been content merely to give summary statements of earlier studies and to discuss instances of variation on an ad hoc basis, being loathe to generalize in any way on the relative merits of the two texts. We agree that the time is ripe for an up-to-date and comprehensive review of the LXX variants which could then be expressed in valid generalizations. The documentation and attempted classification of these variants is, therefore, a valuable contribution of Janzen's work.

At the end of the day, however, we are unable to share Janzen's confidence in the interpretation of the data. Our criticism is simply that in Janzen's legitimate attempt to redress what was lacking in Jer Forschung, he has over-reacted and been too quick to classify each variant as necessarily part of some over-riding scheme, usually a pattern of expansion in the MT. While a full and systematic treatment of the quantitative differences is a

necessary task in itself, it is only one part of the whole. When exclusive preoccupation with "omission" patterns prevents Janzen from seeing the possibility of "translation" patterns, then we have the right to wonder whether this approach is not also defective in some way.

C. The Leading Questions Underlying Janzen's Study

At the close of the introductory chapter, Janzen formulates the two leading questions which motivate the work: 1) "Does the shorter reading of \varnothing arise from the tendency of the translator to abridge his text, or does it reflect a Hebrew Vorlage with the shorter reading?" and 2) "If \varnothing reflects a Vorlage with the shorter reading, is this reading superior or inferior to the longer reading of \mathcal{N} ?" It is useful to have the main issues outlined in this manner; however, we are somewhat uneasy over the way in which the proposed solutions are introduced.

With regard to the question whether the LXX reflects translation abridgement or a shorter Heb Vorlage, Janzen feels that the general absence of a tendency to condense in the Gk OT coupled with the discovery of Qumran specimens of a shorter Heb text have now entirely shifted the burden of proof to those who would continue to hold a theory of condensation. But this is surely to exaggerate or even to misrepresent the state of the matter. Arguments for condensation in other parts of the LXX have certainly not been wanting, e.g. D.H. Gard, The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job, 1952; D.W. Gooding, The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus, 1959. But whatever the case in other books, the evidence for Jer must be tested on its own merits. Nor can we accept the proposition that Heb support for a shorter Heb text in the form of 4QJer^b has finally settled the condensation/expansion controversy. The discovery of the few fragments of this MS has indeed given proof of the real existence at one time of a shorter Heb text than the MT--at least in those passages attested by the fragments of 4QJer^b and for the whole book in so far as it is legitimate to extrapolate from the fragments to the whole--thus

directing more attention to the important pre-history of the Heb Vorlage and exonerating the translators from much of the blame which had been attached to them by Graf and others. But it is expecting too much to assume that the fragments of 4QJer^b have brought about a complete volte-face in the study of the textual problem of Jer or that they have entirely undermined all arguments for deliberate or accidental translator condensation. That such is not the case will be shown in our detailed study of the LXX omissions in the Philistine and Edom oracles.

With regard to the second question, i.e. whether the shorter or longer reading is to be regarded as superior, Janzen realizes that this issue is not to be settled merely by an appeal to the axiom brevior lectio potior, since the most common scribal error of all, haplography, tends in the opposite direction; nonetheless, the net effect of the paragraph dealing with this question is to affirm the principle that "it is a common tendency for texts to grow in transmission", a generalization which is supported by a long footnote (n. 35, pp. 191-192) citing evidence for this tendency in a variety of ancient literatures. While we have no quarrel with Janzen's references and do not wish to dispute the evidence that texts of antiquity often did grow in the process of transmission, we are obliged nevertheless to say that the footnote in question does not give a complete or balanced picture. An appeal to comparative literatures should also mention those cases where the opposite phenomenon has been observed, and such certainly do exist, as the following discussion will illustrate.

From the literature of the Ancient Near East, Janzen quotes two passages from the writings of S.N. Kramer and W.F. Albright supporting the general "tendency of ancient Oriental scribes and compilers to add rather than to subtract" (Albright, FSAC, p. 80). Kramer wrote concerning the tablet UM 29-13-209+29-16-414 of the Akkadian Epic section Gilgamesh and the Land of the Living that it "seems to have a much more expanded text than our reconstructed version" (JCS 1 (1947), 7). But this tablet

represents only one aspect of a much larger and more complex picture. In a Yale thesis, Literary-critical Studies in the Gilgamesh Epic: an Assyriological Contribution to Biblical Literary Criticism, 1972, J.H. Tigay has pointed out the existence of different Akkadian Gilgamesh texts varying among themselves. While some texts expand, others abbreviate; for instance, there is one example of a Hittite version of Gilgamesh condensed to about one-fifth the standard length (see esp. pp. 143 ff., 194ff., 282f.). Similarly, in an unpublished paper, "Literary History: The Gilgamesh Epic and Flood", A.R. Millard has compared the Gilgamesh Epic of Tablet XI with the earlier Epic of Atrahasis. This comparison produced a number of examples of expansion in the later version such as the addition of synonyms, synonymous parallels, descriptive phrases and factual additions, but at the same time showed instances where the earlier text was longer. Millard emphasized the impossibility of determining from one version what the other might have been like at any given point.⁶

In another area, comparisons between the fourteenth century Amarna version of the Myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal and the seventh century edition of the same text from Sultantepe show that the later version is decidedly longer than the earlier. Yet the editor of the Sultantepe version, O.R. Gurney, has expressed his uncertainty about the significance of the longer text; instead of assuming that the "additions" are of late origin, Gurney suggests we may have to reckon with the possibility that the earlier account represents an abbreviated local version (AS 10 (1960), 107). Another example may be taken from the Ras Shamra literature. D.J. Wiseman has pointed out the existence of a short text from Ras Shamra which was probably copied from an earlier Old Babylonian version and which, in Wiseman's opinion, may be yet another example of several episodes recorded on a number of different tablets being reduced to a single brief text. To this Wiseman adds the comment, "This form of literary development (i.e. condensation) appears to exist alongside the so-called 'normal editorial method of expansion' . . . " (JNSL 5 (1977), 83).

In addition to the examples drawn from the Ancient Near East, Janzen also cites instances of secondary expansion in the Iliad, the Mahabharata, the Old Testament Samaritan text and the New Testament Syriac text. But from these fields, too, counter-illustrations exist. In classical studies one who positively disbelieved in the validity of the axiom lectio brevior potior was A.C. Clark. In his text-critical work on Cicero⁷ he demonstrated that scribes were much more prone to omit than to add; his dictum was that "a text is like a traveler who loses a portion of his luggage every time he changes trains". When he applied his findings to the Gospels and Acts⁸ he was virtually rejected by his contemporaries, except for B.H. Streeter who showed himself favourable to some aspects of Clark's theories (The Four Gospels, pp. 131 ff.). Recently, however, there have been signs of a re-appraisal of Clark's work, particularly on the question of the shorter and longer texts of Acts where it is argued that some of the longer readings of the "Western" text may after all be original (cf. M. Black in his contribution to the Eugene A. Nida Festschrift, pp. 119-131, and D. Parker in NTS 24 (1977), esp. 153-155). From the field of LXX studies we may refer to Ch. 2 of R. Hanhart's monograph Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches which, as G.D. Kilpatrick in his review of the book says, contains several examples involving "important modifications of the maxim lectio brevior potior" (GGA 215 (1963), 12).

In the light of the foregoing, it should be clear that we cannot come to a text with any pre-determined notions of how it may have fared in the process of transmission. Every possibility illustrated by ancient texts has to be allowed, and care taken to avoid imposing an alien consistency upon the scribes. In his concluding paragraph on Ch. I, Janzen seems to reduce the options for explaining the textual phenomena of the book of Jer either to a case of expansion in the MT or of haplography in the LXX. At the very least, the examples adduced above must alert us to the possibility of other and more complex forces also having been at work in the development of the texts that we know today as the Gk and Heb versions of the book of Jer.

II. Critique of Janzen's Explanation of the "Zero Variants" in the Oracles Against the Philistines and Edom

In this section we will deal in turn with all of those passages in the oracles against the Philistines and Edom which present quantitative differences between the Gk and Heb texts. Our purpose is to view the respective variants in the light of their immediate as well as broader contexts (including parallel and related passages), and to test the validity of Janzen's explanations for the observed differences. The relevant portion of each passage will be quoted in full from the LXX and MT texts, the "zero variants" in each case being underlined.

29:1a(47:1)

אשר היה דבר יהוה

אל ירמי יהוה הנביא

Ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις

אל פלשתיים

בטרם יכה פרעה את צדה

Ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις] pr. .x̄. ος ἐγενήθη λόγος κυρίου
 προς ιερεμίαν τον προφητην 88; pr. επι τους αλλο-
 φυλους λόγος κυρίου ος ἐγενήθη προς ιερεμίαν τον
 προφητην 84h (επι τους αλλοφ. sub ∞ et λόγος -
 προφητην sub .x̄.) Arm; + (.x̄. O-Q^m) προ του
 παταξαι φαραω την γαζαν O-Q^m Arm; + ος
 (ως 22^c 62) ἐγενετο λόγος κυρίου προς ιερεμίαν
 τον προφητην (+ επι τους αλλοφυλους 51-62-311-449)
 προ του παταξαι φαραω την γαζαν L; om. 106 538⁴
 Bo Arm^p

This verse introduces us unceremoniously into the middle of the controversy surrounding the relationship between the Gk and Heb texts of the book of Jer. Initially three points may be noticed:

1. The verse is found in radically different positions in the two texts: 29:1 in the LXX and 47:1 in the MT. In the LXX the OAN section comes in the middle of the book, while in the MT it is found at the end. In the LXX the Philistine oracle stands fourth in the list of foreign nations following Elam, Egypt, and Babylon; in the MT, the Philistine oracle stands second following Egypt.

2. The introductory heading in the LXX is considerably shorter than that in the MT. In structure the LXX heading resembles the superscriptions found in the oracles against Edom, the Ammonites, Damascus, and Moab (e.g. $\tau\eta \lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\iota\alpha$), except in the use of the preposition $\epsilon\pi\iota$ which is unique among the titles of the OAN section.

3. The Heb of the first part of the verse (the $\text{אשר היה דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו}$ clause) is of a type found in the OT literature only in Jer MT 14:1, 46:1, 47:1, and 49:34. The last three of these occurrences all appear in the OAN section, and two of these at particularly vital points within this section, namely at MT 46:1 (the general superscription to the entire OAN section) and at MT 49:34 (the introduction to the Elam oracle, the oracle which in the Gk order commences the OAN section). The LXX lacks a corresponding phrase for each of the $\text{אשר היה דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו}$ clauses in the OAN section, while the introduction employed at 14:1, $\text{καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ἰερμίου}$, is otherwise the standard Gk rendition of the Heb $\text{ויהי דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו}$.

Janzen deals with the אשר היה דבר יהוה formula, and other similar introductory headings absent from the Gk, in the closing part of his fifth chapter, "Supposed Abridgment in Q", (especially pp. 111-115), a chapter in which the author seeks to

refute the popular notion that the Gk translator for various reasons deliberately abridged his text. With regard to the four $\gamma\psi\chi$ clauses under consideration, therefore, Janzen holds that these testify not to deliberate omission on the part of the translator, but rather to secondary expansion in the Heb text. According to his reconstruction, the formula arose at a late stage in the transmission process of the book, first at 46:1 and 49:34, subsequently by imitation at 14:1 and 47:1, conclusions which are in turn directly based on the author's conviction regarding the priority of the Gk position and internal order of the OAN section.

In order to evaluate these suggestions adequately, it will be necessary to set the discussion in a broader perspective than merely the $\gamma\psi\chi$ היה דבר יהוה formula. As is well known, the editorial framework of the book of Jer contains many examples of stereotyped superscriptions and introductions, data which has been utilized not least in the source-critical analysis of the book. Comparison with the Gk shows that in the majority of cases the LXX follows the MT almost exactly,⁹ an observation which would tend to favour the view that the translator sought to render his parent text quite faithfully, and that consequently any quantitative and/or qualitative difference in the LXX version of these formulas would therefore reflect a different Vorlage. While the force of this argument should not be minimized, ncr can it be asserted that absolute translator fidelity can everywhere be guaranteed. In cases where a different underlying Heb seems definitely called for, one is still faced with great difficulty in deciding between the relative priority of the presumed LXX Vorlage vis-à-vis the MT. Simply to assume in each instance that the shorter LXX represents a better reading seems no more legitimate than everywhere to take for granted that the MT must represent the superior reading. To illustrate these points we will review the principal cases of divergent readings among the introductory formulas in Jer and critically evaluate Janzen's explanation of these.

2:1-2

וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר

הלד וקראת באזני ירושלים

Καί: $\hat{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon$

$$\neg M \wedge b \quad (v.2)$$

Janzen (p. 113, (a)) thinks it possible that in this case neither the Gk nor the Heb represents the original. Certainly it is true, as he says, that the Gk $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota$ constitutes an abrupt transition from direct divine speech in the immediately preceding lines of Ch. 1, and one can hardly believe that this represents the intended editorial introduction to the new block of material in Ch. 2 (any more than one can accept $\gamma\eta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$ of MT 3:1 as the original transition to the content in that chapter). It is less easy to see why the MT heading must also be considered secondary. Janzen suggests that the chapter originally opened directly with $\text{כִּי הָיָה כֵּן יְהוָה}$ and that the present introductory clause in MT was later formulated on the model of 1:4,11,13. But such speculation seems unwarranted. Why must a perfectly normal Heb introduction be called in question by an obviously defective Gk heading? Apart from a prior judgement against the MT there seems no reason for abandoning it as representing the legitimate redactoral framework at this point. As for the LXX or (more likely) its Vorlage, it shows definite signs of having suffered dislocation or textual corruption.

7:1-2

הדבר אשר היה אל ירמיהו מאת יהוה לאמר

צמד בשער בית יהודה

וְקִרְאתָ שֵׁם אֵת הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה וְאַמַּרְתָּ

שמעו דבר יהוה כל יהודה ἡ Ἰουδαία λόγον κυρίου, ἅσα

Janzen (p. 36, # 9) attributes the longer MT heading (up to וַיֹּאמֶר רַח) to secondary harmonization from MT 26:2. But if so, the redactor did a poor job of it since the passage there reads בְּרִאשִׁית מַמְלָכוֹת יְהוּדִים בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה ^{גמרי} לְמַדְרֵי ^א הָיָה הַדְּבָרָהּ מֵאֵת יְיָ לְאַחַר כֵּה, not at all an exact parallel. The latter part of the clause (from הַבְּרִיָּה) Janzen explains (pp. 36-37) as expansion from the similar (not exact) constructions of 17:20, 22:2, and 26:2, on the ground that the phrase does not really fit in 7.2 ("the sermon was delivered not in the gate(s), but in the Temple court (26.2)). Perhaps Janzen is right in relieving the translator of intentional abbreviation or omission, and yet it would be unusual if this sermon lacked an introduction altogether. The editorial heading may have been missing in the translator's parent text, but must it therefore have been a better text?

16:1-2

וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר

Καὶ σὺ ἦν ἄβης γυναῖκα.

לֹא תִקַּח לְךָ אִשָּׁה

λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ

Janzen (p. 113 (c)) thinks it possible that the Gk of this passage preserves a text which stood one stage closer than the MT to a poetic form of the passage in which Jer was instructed not to marry. If the divine command at MT 16:2ff. originally existed in poetry, then the continuity between this passage and the divine address in Ch. 15 would seem to be secure, which in turn would tend to support the superfluity of the MT וַיְהִי formula. But the argument for the secondary character of the MT formula depends entirely on the hypothesis of Ch. 16 being originally poetry later expanded to prose, a proposition difficult to prove. Again, it may be that the formula was missing in the translator's Vorlage, but in itself this would be insufficient evidence by which to establish LXX priority. The presence in the Gk of the phrase λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ adds to

the suspicion that the Gk may not be original here. The phrase is missing in O-233 Arm. Since Origen was very careful not to eliminate anything from the fifth column of his Hexapla which he found in his LXX MSS but was not in the Heb, this reading is immediately suspicious and may be a late Gk insertion.

27(50):1

Λόγος κυρίου, ὃς ἐλάλησεν

הדבר אשר דבר יהוה

ἐν Βαβυλῶνι

אל ככל אל ארץ כשדים

בִּיד יְרֵמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא

If the Gk is translating word for word from its Vorlage, the latter would presumably have read ... דבר יהוה אשר דבר ... a form not otherwise found among the introductory headings of MT Jer. Janzen explains the MT here as expanded partly from the frequent occurrences of כשדים in the Babylon oracle and partly from MT 51:59, which however is not an exceptionally close parallel . הדבר אשר צוה ירמיהו הנביא Faced with two different forms of introductory headings for the same oracle we would be hard pressed to choose between them. Both are clearly the result of an editorial process which went hand in hand with the growth and formation of the book. However, simply to assert that the MT must be expansionistic along the lines laid down by Janzen exceeds the bounds of our evidence.

With the foregoing documentation and discussion of the introductory headings in mind, we may finally consider the formula אשר היה דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו (הנביא) of MT 14:1, 46:1, 47:1, and 49:34, the most problematic of all introductory headings in the book of Jer. We have learned that each case of divergent reading must be tested on its own merits; hence, the shorter or different Gk versions of the אשר formulas cannot be judged superior merely on the basis of Gk

variations in other headings. In this case, however, Janzen makes use of an additional argument to support the claim for LXX priority, namely the relation of $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ headings to the different location and internal order of the oracles against the foreign nations. The argument here is that the OAN section first circulated independently before being introduced into the Jer corpus at 25:13. But since the new edition of Jer would render obsolete a number of Jer MSS, the expedient was adopted of sewing the OAN section to the end of existing MSS as a kind of appendix. Presumably a scroll of the latter type became the basis for the MT tradition, while the edition with the OAN section in the middle became the archetype of the Heb Vorlage employed by the LXX. To accommodate the additional material, a title was provided at 25:13 in the new material $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ and at 46:1 in the old MSS $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$. יהוה אל ירמיהו הנביא על הגוים .

No one would want to underestimate the problems involved, either in the matter of the different location and order of the OAN section or in that of the strange introductory formula $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$, hence we must be grateful for any attempt that seeks to unravel the mysteries behind these textual problems. Janzen's appeal to a Buchwesen theory to account both for the different arrangement of the OAN section in the Gk and Heb texts, as well as for the origin of the $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ formula, must be given a fair hearing. A priori the theory seems plausible enough and has an element of realism about it. Yet many unsolved problems remain. Here we simply wish to point out some of the difficulties we experience with Janzen's reconstruction.

1. Janzen (p. 113) appears to hold that at the time of the insertion of the OAN material into the middle of the book, the section was provided with a title which in the MT constitutes 25:13b $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$. It is true that the phrase ($\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon\lambda$) is regarded by many commentators as a secondary editorial addition, but to assume that it was also intended as a title is another matter

again. As the phrase now stands in the MT it is not a title at all but a relative clause syntactically connected to the previous construction $\text{אֶת כָּל דְּבָרֵי אֲשֶׁר דִּבְרָתִי עָלֶיהָ אֵת כָּל}$ הכתוב בספר הזה. The LXX translator evidently took the אֲשֶׁר clause as a title, but this does not legitimize the interpretation that it was so intended at the time of its composition. Furthermore, in the LXX the phrase is not a title for the OAN section as a whole at all, but for the Elam oracle only: $\text{Ἄ ἰπροφήτευσεν βασιλεύς ἐπὶ τῷ ἔθνει τῶν Αἰλάν}$. Presumably Janzen would argue that τῶν Αἰλάν has been added secondarily in the Gk, thus obscuring what was originally a title for the entire OAN section (see also remark # 3 below), but these contingent assumptions undermine the authority with which Janzen can assert that "in \mathcal{O} the Oracles against Foreign Nations as a group are headed by the statement which in \mathcal{M} constitutes 25.13b β ."

2. Continuing his discussion of the formula at 46:1 Janzen says, "If, as most recent commentators agree, the position of the Oracles at the end of the book is secondary, the clear likelihood is that 46.1 \mathcal{M} was inserted secondarily after the shift, which left the original heading at 25.13". It is difficult to square Janzen's choice of terminology ("after the shift") with his own view of the origin of the OAN material. As noted above, according to Janzen's account there never was any "shift" or dislocation of the material to begin with, merely a co-terminus addition of the material at two different places, one in the middle and one at the end. One might have expected that such mechanical addition of identical material would have been given the same heading.

3. On a comparison with MT 26:1, 27:1, and 28:1, Janzen believes that the Gk at LXX 26:1 $\text{ἐν ἀρχῇ βασιλεύοντες Σιδαίοι βασιλείς ἐγένετο ὁ λόγος οὗτος πρὸς Αἰλάν}$ probably represents the original heading of the Elam oracle rather than MT 49:34 $\text{אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְּבַר יְהוָה אֶל יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא אֲלֵ עֵלָם כְּרָאשִׁית מַלְכוּת אֲ$ חַלְדָּיִים . However, in a footnote (n. 85) he calls attention to the unusual fact that the Elam heading stands at the end of its oracle rather than at the beginning. It is therefore suggested that the superscription originally read τῶν Αἰλάν ἐν ἀρχῇ

βασιλεύοντος Σιδ. βασιλείῳ γίνεται ὁ λόγος οὗτος περὶ Αἰλαμ,
 that haplography occurred between the first and second Αἰλαμ
 and that subsequent restoration was made at the end of the oracle.
 For confirmation of this we are referred to the heading of the
 Egypt oracle of similar construction: Τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ ἐπὶ δύνῃν
 Ἰσραὴλ Νεχῶ βασιλείῳ Αἰγύπτου ὅς ῥα . Implicit in Janzen's
 reconstruction is again the view that the heading at LXX 25:14,
 Ἄ ἐπροφήτευσεν ἱερ. ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ Αἰλαμ consists
 of two elements: Ἄ ἐπροφήτευσεν ἱερ. ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη as the
 general heading to the OAN section, and τὰ Αἰλαμ as the
 (partial) heading for the Elam oracle.

The view that τὰ Αἰλαμ originally did not belong with
 the preceding phrase Ἄ ἐπροφήτευσεν ἱερ. ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη
 (not necessarily a title) has some merit in light of the strange
 juxtaposition of τὰ ἔθνη τὰ Αἰλαμ. But whether haplography
 in a presumed original introduction τὰ Αἰλαμ, ἐν ἀρχῇ ... Αἰλαμ
 is the correct explanation is more difficult to say. For one
 thing, it is extremely unlikely that the Elam superscription
 should have commenced with the accusative article. If anything,
 it must have been constructed with the dative, a hypothetical
 Τῇ Αἰλαμ (as in the Egypt oracle and other oracles,
 e.g. Τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ) which could then conceivably have been changed
 to the accusative in conformity with τὰ ἔθνη when the two
 parts merged. If for some reason, however, the Elam oracle
 lacked a title altogether in the LXX version, τὰ Αἰλαμ may
 have been added simply to supply this lack.

Janzen's preference for the Gk form of the Elam superscription
 (or postscript) derives from his judgement that "the proper form"
 for an introduction with בְּרַשׁוּת מַלְכוּת יְהוֹשִׁיָּא בֶן יִשְׁאִי הוּא הַזֶּה
 בְּרַשׁוּת מַלְכוּת יְהוֹשִׁיָּא בֶן יִשְׁאִי הוּא הַזֶּה, rendered in LXX 33:1 as Ἐν ἀρχῇ βασιλείῳ
 Ἰσραὴλ Νεχῶ βασιλείῳ Αἰγύπτου ὅς ῥα .
 But surely it is precarious to speculate what the "proper form"
 of an introductory statement may or may not have been, and even
 more precarious to assume that the Elam title was necessarily
 modelled upon it. That some sort of dislocation has taken place
 in the heading of the Elam oracle seems beyond question. But as

things stand now, with the major part of the title at the end of the oracle rather than at the beginning, it is the Gk text rather than the Heb that gives more evidence of having suffered dislocation.

4. On p. 114 Janzen writes, "It may be, since two of the four אשר היה דבר יהוה formulas stand at the beginning of the \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{Q} collections respectively, that the formulas arose at the same time, and for the same purpose, as the נד הנה formulas at 48.47 \mathcal{M} and 51.64 \mathcal{M} ". If we understand Janzen correctly, he is saying that a connexion exists, on the one hand between the אשר היה דבר יהוה heading of the Elam oracle and the נד הנה משפט מואב colophon of the Moab oracle (the last oracle in the Gk order) and on the other hand between the אשר היה דבר יהוה formula of 46:1 and the נד הנה colophon at the close of the Babylon oracle (the last in the MT version). According to this interpretation, the Elam title and Moab colophon would presumably have originated in the Heb tradition underlying the Gk, while the formula at 46:1 and the Babylon colophon would have arisen in the MT tradition. However, it is incorrect to say, as Janzen does, that the אשר היה דבר יהוה formula stands at the beginning of the LXX collection since this formula is not even represented in the Gk of 25:14(49:34). In fact, the statement contradicts Janzen's own view expressed on p. 113 "that in \mathcal{Q} the Oracles against Foreign Nations as a group are headed by the statement which in \mathcal{M} constitutes 25.13ב אשר רבא ירמיהו על (כל) [כל] הגוים". Also we would expect that if the Moab colophon had derived from the Gk Vorlage tradition that it would have been attested in the LXX. But it is missing in the Gk just as the Babylon colophon is also missing in that version.

5. At the top of p. 114 Janzen asserts that the shorter heading in the LXX אשר היה דבר יהוה "has the appearance of originality, resembling the catch lines למדיו, לבני עמיון , למלכיה etc." The impression left is that the original heading for the Philistine oracle would have been constructed with the אשר היה דבר יהוה . But this impression is quite misleading. It may be admitted that

the title $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\phi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ resembles the other headings $\tau\eta\ \iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \iota\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, $\text{A}\gamma\gamma\omega\varsigma$, $\tau\eta\ \mu\omega\alpha\beta$ in that they are all short, yet it is virtually certain that the underlying Heb was not $\text{אֲנִי שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּ$ on the model of $\text{אֲנִי שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּ}$ etc., but

$\text{אֲנִי שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּ}$ as in MT. All the headings in the OAN section with בְּ are translated in the LXX with the dative construction (article plus name), whereas the standard translation of בְּ (or בְּ) in this kind of context is $\epsilon\pi\iota$ with accusative, cf. 29(47):5 $\text{בְּאֵה קִרְחָה אֶל עֲזֵה} / \text{אֲנִי שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּ} \text{אֶל יִרְמְיָהוּ}$

6. Janzen concludes his discussion of the $\text{אֲנִי שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּ}$ formula with the statement, "The formula in 47.1 then would be expansion from these two places [i.e. MT 46.1 and 49.34], as would its occurrence in 14.1, where Syr read (surely correctly) $\text{אֲנִי שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּ}$ for $\text{אֲנִי שְׁלַחְתִּי בְּ}$ ". But since we have experienced various difficulties with his explanation of how this formula arose at MT 46:1 and 49:34, neither can we be very confident about the theory of tertiary expansion at 14:1 and 47:1.

When all is said and done, we still do not know how to account for the appearance of this formula, either in MT 47:1 or in the other places. The strange form of the unattached relative clause employed as a heading, coupled with the consistently divergent or missing Gk combine to make one suspect its priority in the MT text. But whether this suspicion proves correct or not, it is essential to see that conclusions of this type must be arrived at independently of any generalized theory regarding the relationship between the texts. As our critique of Janzen's treatment has shown, while the redactoral framework of the LXX Heb Vorlage may at various points have differed from that of the MT, this cannot automatically be taken as a sure guide to a prior or superior structure of the prophet's oracles.

29:1(47:2)

τάδε λέγει κύριος

כה אמר יהוה

The MT text of Jer is characterized by an abundance of prophetic formulas such as כה אמר יהוה, נאם יהוה, and by the use of various forms of the divine name in these formulas, e.g. 1) יהוה, 2) יהוה אבאות, 3) יהוה אלהי, 4) יהוה אלהי ישראל. Often in the LXX these formulas are either missing or the divine name is found in shorter form. In the Philistine and Edom oracles we have six examples of such formulas with divine name, the corresponding Gk and Heb of which are as follows:

29:1(47:2)

As above

29:8(49:7)

τάδε λέγει κύριος

כה אמר יהוה אבאות

29:13(49:12)

τάδε λέγει (εἶπε β-ς-ς) κύριος

כה אמר יהוה

29:14(49:13)

λέγει κύριος

נאם יהוה

29:17(49:16)

LXX om.

נאם יהוה

29:19(49:18)

εἶπε κύριος παντοκράτωρ

אמר יהוה

From the above we observe that in LXX Jer 29 the formula יהוה אלהי כה is attested on each of the three occasions in which it occurs in the MT; the formula יהוה אלהי/נאם is attested on two out of three occurrences; the divine name with the יהוה אלהי formula is shorter in v. 8(7), while the divine name with the formula יהוה אלהי is longer in the Gk of v. 19(18). These findings in LXX Jer 29 are generally typical of the pattern found throughout the LXX. The formula יהוה אלהי כה is almost always attested in the Gk; equivalents for יהוה אלהי/נאם on the other hand, are frequently missing in the LXX; the divine name is usually shorter in the Gk, though on occasion it is longer. The relevant statistics for these generalizations are as follows:

<u>Prophetic Formulas</u>	In MT	Missing in LXX
... אלהי כה	154 ¹⁰	14 (7 in larger context) ¹¹
... נאם	175 ¹²	72 (21 ") ¹³
... אלהי	9 ¹⁴	2 (1 ") ¹⁵

Divine Name in Prophetic Formulas

Form and occurrence in MT	Form and occurrence in LXX
$\text{יהוה אלהי צבאות (19)}$	κύριος 16 ¹⁶
	$\text{κύριος παντοκράτωρ}$ 1 ¹⁷
	missing 2 ¹⁸
$\text{יהוה אלהי ישראל (14)}$	κύριος 8 ¹⁹
	$\text{κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ}$ 5 ²⁰
	missing 1 ²¹
$\text{יהוה אלהי צבאות (1)}$	$\text{κύριος παντοκράτωρ}$ 1 ²²

(31) יהוה אבאוח אלהי ישראל	κύριος	17 ²³
	κύριος, ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραήλ	9 ²⁴
	κύριος, παντοκράτωρ	2 ²⁵
	missing	3 ²⁶
(3) יהוה אלהי אבאוח	κύριος	2 ²⁷
אלהי ישראל	κύριος, παντοκράτωρ	1 ²⁸

Especially noteworthy is the "disappearance act" of יהוה whether inside or outside the prophetic formulas. In the MT Jer this name occurs 82 times (65 times as part of a prophetic formula, 17 times in other contexts), but in the LXX a translation equivalent is found only 11 times.²⁹

Janzen's treatment of the prophetic formulas and divine names is found in his fourth chapter "The Proper Names in Jeremiah", especially pp. 75-86, together with tabulated statistics in Appendices A and B, pp. 139-159.³⁰ In all of these variants, the point of Janzen's discussion is to show that the Gk was translated from a shorter and better Vorlage than the MT.

One is inclined to feel that the case for a shorter Vorlage is at its strongest in the matter of the prophetic formulas and divine names. Respect for the deity would perhaps tend to work in favour of a longer form of the divine name rather than vice versa. Even so, absolute pronouncements on the value of the shorter LXX to an earlier and superior Heb remain elusive. Discussion of the "zero variants" in the ensuing verses of Ch. 29 will highlight the danger of rigidly applying the same solution to every instance of a shorter Gk text regardless of context.

29(47):4

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ

על היום הבא

τοῦ ἀπολίσσαι πάντας τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους·

לשטעלן אים

καὶ ἀφανίσαι τὴν Τύρον καὶ τὴν Σιδῶνα

לכריתן לבן וסידון

καὶ πάντας τοὺς καταλοίπους τῆς βοήθειας αὐτῶν.

כל שריד עז

ὅτι ἐξολιθρεύσει κύριος

כי שדד יהוה תחת

τοὺς καταλοίπους τῶν νήσων

שאריתיהן כפסוק

κύριος] + τοὺς ἄλλοφύλους (+καὶ 36) O L (= α'θ' in Q^m,
 ο' in 86^m)

νήσων] + καὶ καταδόκιμα O L (= α'θ' in Q^m;
 cf. καταδόκιμα οὐ γ' in 86^m)

The "zero variants" in this verse are תחת לשטעלן אים and כפסוק. According to Janzen (p. 59), both of these words are secondary expansions from parallel and related contexts, תחת לשטעלן אים from v. 4a and כפסוק (subsequently) from Gen 10:14, Deut 2:23, Am 9:7, and 1 Chr 1:12. In evaluating the hypothesis that the foregoing words are secondary expansions, it is essential to see the variants in relation to the whole verse, including other "content variants". When this is done, it becomes clear that the LXX and MT give quite different interpretations of the passage, whose respective claims for priority must be carefully weighed.

We may first inquire whether there is any Heb textual evidence for the LXX omissions in question. Janzen suggests--though he is not categorical--that the omission of תחת לשטעלן אים may be supported by 2QJer. According to Baillet's reconstruction of the passage (DJD, III, Textes, p. 65), the line in which תחת לשטעלן אים

occurs (l. 10) has 55 letters. In Janzen's opinion this "seems over long" in relation to lines 5-9, 11-13 which have 47 49 46 49 35 46 48 46 letters respectively. Without אֶת כָּל־שָׂטָנִים l. 10 would have only 46 letters, "a perfect fit". But Janzen's statistics are incomplete. Line 1 on the same fragment has 51 letters and the immediately preceding line of the same passage (on another fragment) has 56 letters. On Baillet's reconstruction, therefore, the 55 letters in l. 10 certainly fall well within the scope of possible line lengths for this MS. Furthermore, since the two other examples of readings regarded by Janzen as secondary in the Philistine oracle (the long introductory formula of v. 1 and כַּפְתֹּר of v. 4b) are both firmly attested by 2QJer, we may assume that אֶת כָּל־שָׂטָנִים of v. 4b was just as certainly present in it as well. The presence of כַּפְתֹּר in 2QJer ought to be decisive for the presence of אֶת כָּל־שָׂטָנִים as well, since according to Janzen כַּפְתֹּר was a secondary gloss added subsequent to the addition of אֶת כָּל־שָׂטָנִים.

2QJer does not, therefore, support the LXX "zero variants" אֶת כָּל־שָׂטָנִים and כַּפְתֹּר. If the LXX was translated from a Heb Vorlage other than the MT, that Vorlage tradition has been entirely lost to us, at least for this passage. However, it is to be noted that in one interesting detail, 2QJer does support a content variant in the LXX of v. 4, namely in the reading וְהָכַרְתִּי (MT לְהָכַרְתִּי) which corresponds to LXX καὶ ἀφαιρήσω. But what is the significance of this observation? Does 2QJer/LXX witness to a better text here? Decidedly not. In the MT, לְהָכַרְתִּי is a perfect parallel to לְשַׁדְּדוֹר, both infinitives introducing phrases which complete the formula עַל הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

". . . on the day that is coming
to destroy all the Philistines,
to cut off from Tyre and Sidon every remaining ally".

However, the Qumran reading וְהָכַרְתִּי completely breaks the parallelism of the phrase and introduces a clumsy change of subject which must be expressed in the form of an intrusive and quite inexplicable quote: ". . . on the day that is coming to destroy all the Philistines. 'And I will cut off from Tyre and Sidon every remaining ally'. For the Lord is destroying the Philistines . . ." It would be quite unjustified to place the blame for

such an awkward and meaningless interruption on the author of the original composition. Thus, while καὶ ἀφανισμῶ in this instance probably comes from a textual variant already present in the translator's Vorlage, it must be this Vorlage rather than the MT that is secondary.

What is true of the LXX καὶ ἀφανισμῶ is also true for the continuation of the LXX phrase: it cannot be said to represent a better version of the oracle than the MT either. By taking the words וְצִדוֹן וְצָר as direct rather than indirect objects, the LXX significantly alters the meaning of the passage. According to the LXX, the prophetic judgement at this point shifts from the Philistines to Tyre and Sidon (καὶ ἀφανισμῶ τὴν Τύρον καὶ τὴν Σιδῶν καὶ πάντα τοὺς καταλοίπους τῆς βοηθείας αὐτῶν "I will wipe out Tyre and Sidon and all the rest of their help") whereas in the MT the focus remains consistently on the Philistines (וְצִדוֹן כָּל שְׂרִיד עֹר "to cut off from Tyre and Sidon every remaining ally [i.e. the Philistines "]³¹). In the MT nothing is said concerning the destruction of Tyre and Sidon; these cities are introduced only by way of emphasizing the destruction of the Philistines, the last remaining ally of the Phoenician cities.³² The LXX phrase καὶ πάντα τοὺς καταλοίπους τῆς βοηθείας αὐτῶν for MT וְצִדוֹן כָּל שְׂרִיד עֹר³³ suggests either a different Vorlage or a loose rendering in which שְׂרִיד was associated with וְצִדוֹן,³⁴ וְצִדוֹן was pointed וְצִדוֹן and the possessive αὐτῶν was added for stylistic completion. In the absence of firm evidence for a different Vorlage and in the light of the difficult Heb poetry of this section, the second explanation must be preferred as the more probable.

This brings us to the last and crucial phrase of the verse, ὅτι ἐξολιθρεύσει κύριος τοὺς καταλοίπους τῶν νήσων. The omission of any words corresponding to MT וְצִדוֹן כָּל שְׂרִיד עֹר and

וְצִדוֹן in the LXX puts the phrase τοὺς καταλοίπους τῶν νήσων in parallelism with τοὺς καταλοίπους τῆς βοηθείας αὐτῶν, so that the pattern commenced with καὶ ἀφανισμῶ τὴν Τύρον καὶ τὴν Σιδῶν is continued to the end of the verse, in each instance the object of destruction being non-Philistine people. In the MT the explicit

mention of כלשתיים and כפתור allows for no ambiguity on who is being addressed. If we now inquire into which of the two versions has the greater claim to originality, the balance is heavily in favour of the MT as the most coherent and consistent verse. By shifting the object of destruction from the Philistines to Tyre and Sidon, the LXX introduces a change which can only be regarded as foreign to the structure and as disturbing to the unity of the original composition.

But is the presence of כלשתיים and כפתור in the Heb really necessary to the sense of the passage? Could it not be that while the LXX has misconstrued the intention of the original in the matter of Tyre and Sidon (direct for indirect object), it may still be a faithful witness to the omission of כלשתיים כפתור ? We may consider the case of כלשתיים first.³⁵

If this word were missing in the original, its omission would have little bearing on the meaning or clarity of the passage. The residual phrase כי שרד יהוה את שארית אי כפתור would probably be an adequate reference to the Philistines, considering their traditional association with Caphtor. In view of this, it is not inconceivable that כלשתיים might have been introduced into v. 4b by a scribe who, already having copied once

כלשתיים לשרד יהוה את כל כלשתיים, when he came to the second automatically followed it again with את כלשתיים (though it should be noted that the phrases are not identical: cf. לשרד יהוה vs. את כלשתיים, and שרד יהוה vs. את כלשתיים). Also possible is the suggestion that כלשתיים might have been a marginal or inter-linear gloss on the phrase שארית כפתור, which was later incorporated into the text. But while such reasoning is certainly possible, it remains pure speculation which in the end may be quite gratuitous.

In the case of כפתור, Janzen contends that it has entered our text from Gen 10:14, Deut 2:23, Am 9:7, and 1 Chr 1:12 subsequent to the intrusion of את כלשתיים. Thus we are to suppose a gloss upon a gloss--at which point speculation has run free of any controls whatsoever. A perusal of the actual texts from which כפתור is said to have derived further weakens

the theory. The texts are as follows:

Gen 10:14 / 1 Chr 1:12

ואת כסלחים אשר יצאו משם כלשתיים ואת כפתרים

Deut 2:23

והצוים הישבים בחצרים עד ניה כפתרים היצאיים
מכפתור השמידם

Am 9:7

הלוא את ישראל העליתי מארץ חצרים וכלשתיים
מכפתור

On the above passages it may be observed: 1) In Gen 10:14 / 1 Chr 1:12 the אשר clause as it stands refers not to the כפתרים but to כסלחים, though admittedly this order may itself be the result of a scribal dislocation (cf. C. Westermann, Genesis, BK, p. 665). 2) The references are widely scattered, and apart from Deut 2:23 do not come from sources generally paralleled in Jer. 3) In no case is there any strong verbal similarity between the Jer version and the other passages, e.g., nowhere else is כפתור mentioned in conjunction with coastlands or islands. The secondary derivation of כפתור in MT 47:4 from the above passages seems, therefore, not convincing.

In another place (Ch. IV "The Proper Names in Jeremiah", p. 79) Janzen cites ליי כפתור (sic) as an example of the MT making a hypothetically original ליי more explicit. But against the theory of MT expansion one ought also to weigh the consideration that there exists a perfectly legitimate explanation why כפתור may have been omitted by the translator. The standard translation of כפתור in the LXX is Καππαδοκία. But as has already been pointed out in Ch. 2, (p. 64) Καππαδοκία is a mistranslation of כפתור and certainly does not fit in the present context; "the island of Cappadocia" would have been a patent geographic absurdity. Hence we may well imagine a translator puzzled by the strange ליי כפתור and resolving the dilemma by simply omitting כפתור and writing ליי. ³⁶ The suggestion is indeed speculative, but it is worth at least as much as the theory that כפתור came as a second-layer gloss

from far-removed and peripheral passages.

As for the proposition that both פלשתים and כפתור are interpolations, this seems quite unwarranted. In the context of vv. 3-4, a hypothetical phrase כי שדד יהוה את שארית איים would have little meaning. Finally, the metrical scansion of the line does not favour the exclusion of פלשתים and כפתור. The line as it stands consists of a 3:3 bi-colon, the most common stress pattern in Heb poetry.

29(47):5-6

ἦκει φαλάκρυν ἐπὶ Τάξαν,

באה קרחה אל נזה

ἀπερρίφη Ἀσκαλὼν

נדמתה אשכולון

καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι Ἐνακίμ.

שארית עמרם

(v.6) ἕως τίνος κόψεις

עד מתי תתגודדי

ἡ μάχαιρα τοῦ κυρίου;

(v.6) הוי הרב ליהוה

ἕως τίνος οὐχ ἡσυχάσεις;

עד מנה לא תשט

ἀποκατάστηθι εἰς τὸν κολεόν σου,

האפכי אל תערך

ἀνάπαυσαι καὶ ἐπάρθητι.

הרגני ודמי

ἕως τίνος οὐχ ἡσυχάσεις] pr. εως ποτε συστραφησεσθε
L Ση⁷⁵ τητ (= σ' in 86⁷⁵)

κόψεις] κοψής S^x 87 alii; κοψεται 407; κοψει 410
τητ Olymp

In this passage there is only one "zero variant" in the Gk text, namely the omission of a corresponding word for the Heb exclamation הוי. This example is cited by Janzen (p. 125) in his short penultimate chapter (Ch. 6), "Miscellaneous Variants", a chapter intended to deal with those zero variants which cannot easily be fitted into well defined categories such as "Double Readings", "Additions from Parallel and Related Contexts", etc., and hence are of more difficult interpretation. After giving extended comment on six such miscellaneous variants, Janzen provides two continuous lists of zero variants, one consisting of Heb words (i.e. those absent in the Gk) and one of Gk words (i.e. those absent in the Heb). The variant הוי of 47:6 occurs in the former of these lists. The question, then, is whether any reason can be cited for the absence in the LXX of a Gk word corresponding to הוי and whether the LXX possibly attests a better reading than the MT, in which case the latter would have to be regarded as conflate or expansionist.

It is clear that the LXX has divided the Heb phrases in question differently from the MT, for whereas in the MT the phrase תהגודדי is an independent question at the close of v. 5, in the LXX it has been associated with the subsequent Heb phrase חרב ליהוה (הוי), resulting in the translation ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς οὐρανὸς καὶ ὡς οὐρανὸς (this explains why in the Gk text v. 6 commences earlier than in the Heb). But it can hardly be argued that this linking of תהגודדי with חרב ליהוה represents a superior division to that of the MT; in fact, it is decidedly inferior. That תהגודדי is to be associated with its preceding phrase ... באה קרחה אל עזה... is clear from a comparison of Deut 14:1, Jer 16:6 and Jer 48:37 where in each case, as in Jer 47:5, baldness and acts of self-mutilation are referred to in close proximity as common features of pagan mourning. The LXX completely misses the point (as does Duane Christensen (pp. 212-213) in his emendation of תהגודדי to תהגוררי following 2QJer),³⁷ hence the false association of תהגודדי with חרב ליהוה.

But how then are we to explain the absence of הוי in the

Gk text? Its omission in the translator's Vorlage is of course a possibility to be reckoned with, but in this particular case it seems extremely unlikely. Since עַד מֵתִי תִּתְּנוּ דָּרֶךְ must stand as an independent question at the close of v. 5, and since MT v. 6 constitutes an address to a personified "sword of Yahweh" it is practically essential that the address be preceded by a vocative such as הוּא. Without it, the phrase

לִיהוּה עַד מֵתִי לֹא תִּשְׁפָּטֵנִי lacks the poetic vigour that is characteristic of the rest of the composition. We regard הוּא, therefore, as almost certainly integral to the original poem. Its omission in the Gk is most naturally explained as a deliberate disregard of a word that did not fit the translator's (false) reading of the Heb. It is doubtful that the omission of such a word was associated with any crisis of conscience on the translator's part, at least not more so than the misrendering of the reflexive תִּתְּנוּ דָּרֶךְ by the simple אֲשַׁפֵּט, or by the strange rendition of מֵתִי by θῆρ at the close of the verse. The argument that the translators had such an inviolable notion of Holy Writ that they could not possibly have omitted any word that lay in their Vorlage is not borne out by our analysis.³⁸

We do not know how Janzen would have explained the variant הוּא in 29(47):6. In the introduction to his chapter he suggests that some of the variants listed there may have arisen through scribal lapse, others are probably to be taken as glosses, though the source or reason for these glosses may not be apparent. Ehrlich (p. 356) did indeed think that הוּא arose as dittography "aus dem Vorhergehenden" but this is hardly credible since there is not much resemblance between הוּא and the termination of תִּתְּנוּ דָּרֶךְ; we cannot believe that Janzen would have approved of the suggestion. Nor is there any rationale for thinking that הוּא might be a gloss on הַרְבֵּה. In the light of contextual considerations, the variant weighs as heavily against the Gk as it does in favour of the Heb, and we think, therefore, that the LXX is a witness here neither to a shorter Vorlage nor to a better reading, but to an erroneous Gk translation and probably deliberate omission.

29:10(49:9)

ὅτι τρυγηταὶ ἦλθον,

גב באו ברגים

οἱ οὐ καταλείψουσίν σοι κατάλειμμα

היוברים לא יאשימו

ἦλθον B-5-106'-538 Q' C-613 Co Arab Thl'] + σοι
rel. = Compl, Rahlf.

In this verse the Gk apparently has no corresponding word for גב following ἦλθον. This small omission is not noted by Janzen but it is doubtful that it provides support for a shorter Heb Vorlage. The phrase is closely paralleled in Ob 5 where גב, as expected, is translated by πρὸς σε. Harmonization of parallel passages in the Heb is always a possibility, so that it could be proposed that גב in MT Jer 49:9 was added at a late stage in conformity with the Ob passage, the LXX bearing witness to an earlier reading; however, other examples of the loose handling of the text by the translator makes such an argument less likely. In addition to the "zero variant" גב, the Gk of this phrase also has two odd translation equivalents, ὅτι for אב and κατάλειμμα(ατα) for היוברים,³⁹ as well as two LXX plusses, οἱ and σοι. Alternative explanations might be that the relative pronoun οἱ is in fact intended to represent גב, or that the dative of the personal pronoun σοι, originally translated גב but has since been dislocated in the Gk from an original position following ἦλθον to its present position following καταλείψουσιν.⁴⁰ In spite of such possibilities, the simplest explanation still seems to be that the translator has proceeded in a free, quasi-paraphrastic way in which the Heb preposition גב following אב simply failed to be expressed.

29:13(49:12)

ὅτι τάδε λέγει κύριος,

כי כה אמר יהוה

Οἷς οὐκ ἦν νόμος

הנה אשר אין משפטם

πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον,

לשתות הכוס

ἔπιον·

שתו ישתו

καὶ συ ἀθωωμένη

ואתה הוא נקה תנקה

οὐ μὴ ἀθωωθῇς

לא תנקה

כי שתה תשתה

Οἷς B-S-538 A-106' C Co Aeth Arab] pr. 1800 rel.

ἔπιον] pr. (·X·O) πιοντες O L Arm Tht

ἀθωωμένη] + (·X·O) ἀθωωθηση O L^{-51 62 449} 239 Armἀθωωθῇς B-S-106'-538 La⁵³ Co Aeth Arab] + οτιπινουσα πινη L Tht ; + οτι πινων (πινω, πινουσ, πινοντι various)
πινουσι rel. = Ald, Compl, Rahlfs

This verse has five "zero variants" in the Gk text. The words apparently unrepresented in the LXX are הנה, שתו, הוא, תנקה, and כי שתה תשתה. Of these Janzen deals with the first (הנה) and the last (כי שתה תשתה), both of which he asserts to be missing in the Gk by haplography (p. 118). Whether the haplography occurred already in the Heb Vorlage or later in the transmission of the Gk text, Janzen is reluctant to judge, though of the two instances mentioned here he cites the former (הנה) as an example of a "certain or probable" case of haplography in

the Heb Vorlage. We will need to evaluate these suggestions of Janzen as well as to analyze the other variants in the verse not mentioned by him.

הנה

The particle הנה occurs five times in the MT text of the Philistine and Edom oracles: vv. 2, 12, 15, 19, 22. By contrast, in the LXX of these oracles it is attested only three times, vv. 2, 20(19) and 23(22), each time by the familiar translation ?δoς, while it is missing in vv. 13(12) and 16(15). As already noted the הנה of v. 13(12) Janzen thinks may have dropped out in the translator's Vorlage through haplography (יהוה הנה); the omission of the הנה in v. 16(15) he does not comment upon.

The rate of omission of הנה in LXX Ch. 29 (40%) is considerably greater than in the rest of the book. In fact, this little word (with variants הנה, הנה), of such frequent occurrence in the MT text of Jer (approx. 130x), is surprisingly well attested in the LXX, a translation equivalent for it being absent only some fifteen times⁴¹ (not counting those occasions when it is missing as part of a longer passage absent in the Gk). In the light of its regular attestation elsewhere, Janzen's suggestion that its omission in LXX 29:13 may be due to scribal accident in the Heb Vorlage gains credibility. The same may be said for the omission of הנה at 39(32):17 (cf. Janzen, #26, p. 118).

As for the omission of a Gk word for הנה at v. 16(15), this is less readily explained. There it forms part of the introductory expression כִּי-הנה, missing in toto in the LXX. No easy scribal explanation for its omission lies close at hand, though a shorter Vorlage is certainly a possibility. However, such a Vorlage would be no safe guide to an earlier reading than the MT (cf. the parallel passage in Ob 2 which commences the same sentence with הנה). In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we accept כִּי-הנה as integral to the

composition; for some reason the phrase has not been preserved in the Gk.

וְהוּא

Janzen does not comment on וְהוּא in this verse but Duane Christensen (p. 230, n. h) regards it as a development of the interrogative particle. This view he defends on the ground that the LXX gives no evidence that the וְהוּא of MT was present in the text. Another theory along the same lines might be that

וְהוּא derived from the initial ה of an original niph. inf. abs. הִנֵּה as in the parallel passage of MT 25:29.

Yet it is quite impossible to say what may or may not have been in the translator's text at this point. The use of the pronoun וְהוּא to strengthen another pronominal subject is certainly a well-established characteristic of biblical Heb (GK, 141b) and is found elsewhere in Jer (cf. 14:22). While the Gk καὶ οὗτο translates וְהוּא, we cannot rule out the possibility that οὗτο was intended also to cover וְהוּא. The addition of αὐτός following οὗτο may have been regarded as unduly cumbersome Gk. The absence of an explicit translation word for וְהוּא, therefore, cannot be taken as sure evidence of a shorter Heb Vorlage in this verse.

שְׁתֵּי שָׁתָה כִּי תִקַּח

The remaining "zero variants" in the LXX of 29:13(49:12) all have to do with constructions involving the Heb inf. abs. These are שְׁתֵּי שָׁתָה, תִּקַּח תִּקַּח, and the phrase כִּי

שְׁתֵּי שָׁתָה. In the first two of these--not dealt with by Janzen--the Gk has shorter forms than the Heb constructions (ἵπνον and ἀθωμίνην respectively); in the last, the entire Heb phrase is without corresponding equivalent in the Gk. In order to see these renditions of the inf. abs. in a broader perspective it will be necessary to look at the translation of the inf. abs. generally in the LXX and in Jer, at specific parallels and contexts related to 29:13(49:12), and finally at the

internal dynamics of 29:13(49:12) itself.

In the LXX, the Heb inf. abs. with finite verb is usually translated in one of two ways: 1) by the juxtaposition of verb and its cognate noun (usually in the dative, sometimes in the accusative); 2) by the juxtaposition of verb and its corresponding participle (or the participle of a verb of kindred meaning). In an article devoted to the subject (JTS 9 (1907-08), 597-601), Thackeray claimed that whereas both methods are employed throughout the LXX, the verb-noun method (which has parallels in the Gk) predominates in the Pentateuch, while the verb-participle method (which is strictly "translatese") predominates in most other books, the only exceptions being Is, Ez, Mi, and the A text of Josh and Jud. For Jer this assertion can readily be documented: clear cases of participle-verb constructions outnumber those of noun-verb constructions by 2 to 1.⁴²

In the continuation of his article Thackeray proceeded to remark that in a considerable number of passages (some fifty in all according to him), the inf. abs. is not rendered at all, most of these instances being found in the Pentateuch and Jer α. He further suggested that these omissions were no doubt intentional and not merely due to a difference of texts, since "the translators of these books showed a greater freedom in their work" (p. 600). Thackeray does not cite references, but in the case of Jer our research fails to bear out his generalization. That is, the evidence does not support any pattern of omission of the inf. abs. on a grand scale in Jer α (only four omissions); moreover, an equal number of omissions are found in Jer β.⁴³ We should not be quick, therefore, to explain the shorter Gk in 29:13(49:12) by an appeal to a general tendency in Jer LXX to shorten or omit the inf. abs. construction. In the overwhelming number of cases the Heb inf. abs. in Jer is rendered in the Gk by one means or another.

A more profitable line of inquiry is to look at the important parallel passages to 29:13(49:12), namely the "Cup of Wrath" passage in 32:14-15(25:28-29). The relevant portions read:

οὕτως εἶπε κύριος

כה אמר יהוה זבאות

Πρόντες πίεσθε·

שתו שתו

.....

.....

(4.15) καὶ ὑμεῖς καθάρσιν

(4.15) ואתם הנקה חנקו

οὐ μὴ καθαρισθῇτε

לא חנקו

It will be observed that in this case the first inf. abs.,

שתו שתו, is translated exactly according to the normal participle-verb pattern, πρόντες πίεσθε. Since the Heb of the Edom passage is apparently modelled directly on the "Cup of Wrath" passage, we believe the original form of the Edom oracle at this point would also have contained the inf. abs. construction as in MT 49:12. Why then the shorter Gk in LXX 29:13? One possibility is that the Vorlage was already shorter, though if so, this need not represent a reading earlier than the MT. On the other hand, the expression may have been deliberately shortened by the translator. On his interpretation of the phrase, the drinking of the cup by those for whom it was not appointed was already a fait accompli, an interpretation conveniently facilitated by reading שתו (= ἔπιον) rather than שתו (= שתה, cf. this form in the last phrase of the verse), the future שתו being displaced in the process. In 32:14(25:28), where the inf. abs. construction immediately follows the Messenger Formula, the translator was not deflected from rendering the construction according to the traditional pattern of participle-verb. But whether this interpretation of the translator's procedure is correct or not, or whether his Vorlage was already shorter, the point to be emphasized remains that comparison with the parallel passage of 32:14(25:28) shows that it is the Gk and not the Heb which is defective here.

In the case of the next inf. abs. in the verse, נקה חנקו, the parallel passage of 32:15(29:29) is also instructive, though in a different way. In these instances it is noteworthy that both Gk verses are shorter than their corresponding Heb of the

MT in identical fashion, an observation which might seem to point to a different Vorlage. However, the reason for their similarity may lie elsewhere. The passages in question are as follows:

29:13(49:12)

καὶ σὺ ἀθώωμένη

ואתה הוּא נקה תנקה

οὐ μὴ ἀθώωθῃς

לֹא תנקה

32:15(25:29)

καὶ ὑμεῖς καθάρσει

ואתם הנקה תנקו

οὐ μὴ καθαρισθῇτε

לֹא תנקו

In spite of some minor differences between the two Gk translations,⁴⁴ the striking similarity between them is that in both cases the Gk appears to pass over the first(נק-) תנקה and translate as though the Heb read (נק-)תנקה לֹא תנקה(ה) . But by doing so the Gk loses the emphatic effect of the Heb rhetorical question. The point of the Heb in MT 25:29 is to emphasize the presumption of the nations in thinking that they should escape punishment when even the people of God's own city will not escape it; similarly in MT 49:12 the point emphasized is the presumption of the Edomites in thinking that they would go unpunished when even the undeserving nations will not escape punishment. These contrasts are effectively served by the inf. abs. in rhetorical question followed by the emphatic denials,(נק-)תנקה לֹא . To short-circuit the question is to lose the force of the comparisons and the poetic vigour of the Heb. (Other instances where נקה is used in the inf. abs. construction are the parallel passages of 26(46):28 and 37(30):11, as well as Nah 1:3). It is possible that the Gk translator simply did not understand the expressions ואתה הוּא נקה תנקה / ואתם הנקה תנקו as questions and could not make sense of the passage without eliminating (נק-)תנקה and reading נקה(ה) directly with the following (נק-)תנקה לֹא . There is no reason why a similar process should not account for the same translation

phenomenon occurring in both verses.

As for the omission in the Gk of any words corresponding to the last inf. abs. in the verse, כִּי שָׁתָה תִּשְׁתָּה , Janzen may well be right in proposing haplography as the reason for this "zero variant". No other persuasive explanation is immediately available. Just as לֵב תִּקְרֶה in MT 25:29 is followed by a כִּי clause, so the same was likely true of MT 49:12. The view of Rahlfs that the phrase ὅτι πῶς πείσεται found in the majority of MSS (but not in the B group) should be regarded as original LXX is not convincing on text-critical grounds (see Ch. 3, p. 154).

29:14(49:13)

ὅτι κατ' ἑμαυτοῦ ὤμοσα,

כי בי נשבעתִי

λέγει κύριος,

נאם יהוה

ὅτι εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν

כי לשמה לחרפה

καὶ εἰς κατάρσιν

לחרב ולקללה

ἔση ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς,

תהיה בצרה

καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ πόλεις αὐτῆς

וכל עריה

ἔσονται ἔρημοι εἰς αἰῶνα

תהיינה לחרבות עולם

εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς κατάρσιν]

רג. εἰς αφανισμόν και 26; εἰς αφανισμόν και εἰς

ονειδισμόν και εἰς αβατον και εἰς καταρσιν O L

The presence of four rather than three (as in LXX) coordinated substantives in the MT of this verse (ἄβυσσος, ὀνειδισμὸν, κατάρασιν / לַכַּלְה, לַחֲרָה, לַחֲרָפָה) is attributed by Janzen (p. 59) to a "typical filling out of this series". In his opinion, the reading לַחֲרָה is a further example of expansion from parallel contexts in the MT. The series in question is one of several such found in the OT. In order to evaluate the relative merits of the various proposals which have been put forward to account for the absence of any Gk word in 29:14(49:13) for MT לַחֲרָה, it will be necessary to review all the occurrences of the Heb series and their Gk counterparts. In formal structure at least, the series has its prototype in Deut 28:37. It is employed sparingly in Ki/Chr and Ez, but is fully exploited in the prose sections of Jer. The following passages come under consideration:

1. Deut 28:37

ἐν κινήματι καὶ παραβολῇ

לַשְׂמָה לַמַּשָּׁל

καὶ διηγῆματι

וּלְשִׁנְיָה

2. 1 Ki 9:7 (par. 2 Chr 7:20)

Ki: εἰς ἄφανισμὸν καὶ λालῆμα

לַמַּשָּׁל וּלְשִׁנְיָה

Chr: εἰς παραβολὴν καὶ εἰς διήγημα

———— " ————

3. 2 Ki 22:19

εἰς ἄφανισμὸν καὶ εἰς κατάραν

לַשְׂמָה וּלְכַלְה

4. Jer 19:8

εἰς ἄφανισμὸν καὶ εἰς συριγμὸν

לַשְׂמָה וּלְשִׁרְקָה

5. Jer 24:9

εἰς διασκορπισμὸν

לְזוּעָה לַרְעָה

6. Jer 24:9

εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς παραβολήν

לחרפה ולמשל

καὶ εἰς μῖσος καὶ εἰς κατάραν

לשנינה ולקללה

7. Jer 25:9

εἰς ἀφανισμὸν καὶ εἰς συριγμὸν

לשמה ולשרקה

καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμόν

ולחרבות

8. Jer 25:11

εἰς ἀφανισμόν

לחרבה לשמה

9. Jer 29:14(49:13)

εἰς ἄβατον καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν

לשמה לחרפה

καὶ εἰς κατάρασιν

לחרב ולקללה

10. Jer 32:4 (25:18)

εἰς ἐρήμωσιν καὶ εἰς ἄβατον

לחרבה לשמה

καὶ εἰς συριγμόν

לשרקה ולקללה

11. Jer 36(29):18

LXX missing vv. 16-20 לאלה ולשמה ולשרקה ולחרפה

12. Jer 49(42):18

εἰς ἄβατον καὶ ὑποχείρισι

לאלה ולשמה

καὶ εἰς ἄραν καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμόν

ולקללה ולחרפה

13. Jer 51(44):6

εἰς ἐρήμωσιν καὶ εἰς ἄβατον

לחרבה לשמה

14. Jer 51(44):8

εἰς κατάραν καὶ εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν

לקללה ולחרפה

15. Jer 51(44):12

εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν

לאלה לשמה

καὶ εἰς κατάραν

ולקללה ולחרפה

16. Jer 51(44):22

εἰς ἐρήμωσιν καὶ εἰς ἄβυσσον

לחרבה ולשמה

καὶ εἰς ἄραν

ולקללה

17. Ez 5:14

εἰς ἔρημον

לחרבה ולחרפה

18. Ez 23:46

ταραχὴν καὶ διαπαρῃν

לזעוה ולבוז

19. Ez 29:9

ἀπώλεια καὶ ἔρημος

לשמה וחרבה

20. 2 Chr 29:8

εἰς ἔκστασιν καὶ εἰς ἀφανισμὸν

לזועה לשמה

καὶ εἰς συριγμὸν

ולשרקה

21. cf. Mich 6:16

εἰς ἀφανισμὸν ... εἰς συριγμὸν

לשמה ... לשרקה

καὶ ὀνειδὴ λαῶν

וחרפת עמי

Observations on the above:

1. The prototype of Deut 28:37 is most closely approximated in 1 Ki 9:7 and Jer 24:9.⁴⁵ After Jer 24:9 the words

לשח and שנינה do not occur again in this series. In fact, שנינה occurs in the OT only in those passages from Deut, Ki/Chr, and Jer already cited. On the other hand, the first word of the Deut series, שח, becomes the cornerstone of the Jer passages, being found in all but three (# 5, # 6, and # 14) of the Jer series, as well as frequently by itself (sometimes this word is found in the form שחה). Other terms that occur, listed in their order of decreasing frequency are: (2x) הרבות / הרבה(ה), (3x) אלה, (6x) שרקה, (8x) קללה, (8x) הרפה, (1x) בז, (1x) רעה, (3x) זעוה / זועה.

2. It is evident that there is no standard length for the series; it may consist of two, three, or four terms respectively.⁴⁶

3. The Gk is shorter than the Heb by one term in five of the Jer passages: (# 5, # 8, # 9, # 10, # 15), and once in Ez (# 17). On one occasion in Jer (# 11), the entire series is missing as part of a larger passage absent in the Gk.

Discussion of the five "zero variants" in Jer:

In each of the five "zero variants" Janzen prefers the shorter LXX as the better text, the MT in his opinion having suffered conflation through dittography in the case of לרעה of 24:9, and expansion from parallel contexts in the case of להרבה of 25:11 (from 25:18) and לקללה of 25:18 (from 24:9), and "typical filling out" of this pejorative series in the case of להלה of MT 44:12 and להרב of 49:13.

Probably we shall never obtain a definitive explanation for all the variants mentioned. Certainly in a stereotyped formula such as this one must entertain the possibility of both scribal conflation and expansion having taken place, so that a priori

there is no reason for denying that some of the LXX omissions may well go back to an earlier stage in the transmission process than that represented by the MT. By the same token, it should be realized that the number of terms could vary just as easily by virtue of scribal omission. Only in rare cases can it be said that the evidence is conclusive one way or another. Our main criticism of Janzen's handling of the variants in question is that the nature of the data is more complex than might appear through his brief comments. In some instances, probability lies in favour of his explanation, other times it does not, frequently the evidence is ambiguous. We work in the realm of probabilities, but the degree of probability can never be satisfactorily determined until all the evidence is in. Neglect to mention some of the contrary evidence naturally raises question marks over what otherwise might seem obvious solutions. In the evaluation of the five "zero variants" below we will first quote Janzen's notation in full before proceeding with our critique.

[ונתתם לזוועה לרעה לכל חלכות הארץ " 24:9
 ✕ om. לרעה, which clearly is intrusive here (cf. 15.4, 29.18, 34.17; Dt. 28.25). The addition is best explained as conflation (cf. Ziegler, Beiträge, p. 87), from a manuscript in which לזוועה was transcribed as " לרעה" (pp. 12-13, # 16).

The case for dittography in the above example is a strong one. The term לרעה does not occur in this series elsewhere, and in each of the Jer passages cited (15:4, 29:18, 34:17), לזוע occurs by itself in a stereotyped phrase which has its prototype in Deut 28:25. Moreover, the transcriptional explanation for the appearance of לרעה is persuasive. Nonetheless, a comprehensive review of the evidence should also note that לזועה does not always occur alone in the OT. In Ez 23:46 and 2 Chr 29:8

לזועה / לזועה is found in series of two and three terms respectively (לזועה ולבז and לזועה ולשרקה), all of which are attested by the Gk, so that in this sense Jer 24:9 with two terms is not anomalous. Furthermore, like לרעה of Jer 24:9, the second term of the Ez passage (לבז) is also

unique to the series. In other respects, however, the Ez and Chr passages do not conform to the pattern of the Deut/Jer formula (cf. the phrase לכל מלכות הארץ in the latter pair) so that the probability remains high that לרעה in Jer 24:9 is secondary by dittography as Janzen suggests.

25:11 " לחרבה] om. \varnothing . From verse 18" (p. 45, # 57).

The series in this verse consists of two terms לשמה לחרבה , the first of which Janzen thinks is intrusive from v. 18 of the same chapter. However, an exact parallel to the series in 25:11 is found in 51(44):6 where the Gk attests both terms.⁴⁷ While the absence of a conjunction between the two terms appears to produce an awkward asyndeton in the Heb--thus perhaps pointing to the intrusive nature of one of the terms--the presence or absence of the conjunction in this and similar series appears to follow no consistent pattern (some Heb MSS have the conjunction in both 25:11 and 44:6). In view of such consideration, the case for MT expansion is less assured.

32:4(25:18) " ולקבלה כיום הזה] om. \varnothing ולקבלה
is from the related series in 24.9 and elsewhere. On כיום הזה
as a gloss, see nos. 117, 163, 173 [sic: the correct numbers are 116, 162, 169], and Brevard S. Childs, 'A Study of the Formula, "Until This Day", ' JBL 82 (1963), 279-292" (p. 45, # 58).

As observed in Janzen's notation, ולקבלה (the fourth and last term of the Heb series) is part of a larger word-complex missing in the LXX. Rudolph (HAT, p. 164) has suggested that the phrase כיום הזה may have been deliberately omitted in the LXX because it did not correspond to the historical reality of the translator's day.⁴⁸ In the article referred to, Childs argues that the phrase עד היום הזה (with variants) "in the great majority of cases is a formula of personal testimony added to, and confirming, a received tradition" (p. 292). But if the formula was easily added, it could presumably also be easily

dropped (in this case by the translator). If this were so,

ה ל ב ק ל may have been accidentally omitted in the process. While no firm conclusion is possible, it is not sufficient simply to assert that ה ל ב ק ל derives from the related series in 24:9 without considering other possibilities.

51(44):12 The MT of the last phrase of 44:12 reads והיו לאלה לשמה ולקללה ולחרפה. Janzen reconstructs the Heb Vorlage of the LXX as והיו לשמה ולקללה ולחרפה. On MT לאלה he comments, "From 42.18, a typical filling out of the pejorative series" (p. 58, # 166).

The series in MT 42:18 is indeed identical to MT 44:12 so that the theory of Heb expansion appears specious at first sight. But in both verses the Gk translations are fraught with difficulties. For greater ease in following the discussion, it will be helpful to reproduce the corresponding texts:

49(42):18	
εἰς ἄβυσσον καὶ ὑποχείρισιν	לאלה ולשמה
καὶ εἰς ἄρην καὶ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν	ולקללה ולחרפה
51(44):12	
εἰς ὀνειδισμόν καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν καὶ εἰς κατάρσιν	_____ " _____

It will be observed that in both Gk series we are confronted by anomalous translations and by apparent textual dislocations. As the texts now stand in 49(42):18, εἰς ἄβυσσον seems to correspond to ה ל ב and ὑποχείρισιν to ה ש ב (as indicated in the Heb-Gk equivalence apparatus of HR), but the reverse is clearly the case (as effectively demonstrated by Muraoka,⁴⁹ contra Ziegler, Jeremias, p. 45). The anomalous Gk word in this series is ὑποχείρισιν, which is odd both in form and substance (L has εἰς ὑποχείρισιν, which at least in form follows the typical pattern, but it is unlikely that this represents the original LXX reading; rather, it must be a stylistic modification

of the strange LXX). The uncharacteristic form and unique translation equivalence of $\delta\pi\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ / $\eta\lambda\alpha$ makes one suspect a late intrusion, perhaps to conform the number of terms to the Heb, but executed with extreme clumsiness.

Turning to 51(44):12, the pairing of Heb/Gk equivalents in this verse is, if anything, even more difficult. According to present word order, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\delta\upsilon\omicron\iota\delta\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu$ corresponds to $\eta\lambda\alpha$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\alpha\pi\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\upsilon$ to $\eta\psi\alpha$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ to $\eta\lambda\alpha$, leaving $\eta\psi\alpha$ without equivalence. But since $\eta\psi\alpha$ is consistently rendered by $\delta\upsilon\omicron\iota\delta\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, and since $\alpha\pi\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$ ⁵⁰ and $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ must correspond to $\eta\psi\alpha$ and $\eta\lambda\alpha$ respectively, it is necessary again to postulate a textual dislocation either in the Gk or Heb texts and agree with Janzen that $\eta\lambda\alpha$ is indeed the "zero variant" in this series.

But must we also follow Janzen in assuming that $\eta\lambda\alpha$ of MT 44:12 derives from MT 42:18 as a "typical filling out"? In the light of the textual instability of both Gk verses, this interpretation seems too facile. Since the problem word in both instances appears to be $\eta\lambda\alpha$, we may just as soon wonder whether the root cause of the discrepant Gk texts may not lie in the translator's unfamiliarity with this word. The only other place where we can test the translation of $\eta\lambda\alpha$ in Jer is at 23:10 where, however, it was misread as $\eta\lambda\alpha$ and translated $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ (in 36(29):18, where the word also appears, it is missing as part of a larger context). If the translator was in fact unfamiliar with the word, he may simply have omitted it. A less likely line of reasoning is to note the presence in both series of the synonyms $\eta\lambda\alpha$ and $\eta\lambda\alpha$, and to wonder whether the translator thought it sufficient to render only one. No easy solution is in sight. This much at least must be said again, that the simple derivation of $\eta\lambda\alpha$ in MT 44:12 from MT 42:18 without further qualification does not do justice to the complex nature of the textual problems involved.

29:14(49:13) " לחרב om. §. Typical filling out of this series" (p. 59, #182).

This brings us finally to the passage with which we began the discussion, the omission in 29:14(49:13) of a corresponding Gk word for the Heb לחרב. Two reasons have generally been cited in favour of the shorter Gk at this point. First, the form of the word is anomalous; elsewhere in Jer it is found in the form חרב (twice in the plural חרבות -- MT 25:9 and the second occurrence in MT 49:13), which corresponds well with the other feminine substantives all terminating in ת. Secondly, commentators have felt that חרב is of a somewhat different order in comparison with the other terms in this series which all express human reactions: אלה, קללה, שמח(ה), חרפה, שרק, זונה. Thus Rudolph (p. 288) refers to לחרב in MT 49:13 as "Dieser objektive Ausdruck zwischen den subjektiven", with the implied suggestion that חרב could not have been part of the original series since it would be out of character with the rest. Traditionally, therefore, לחרב in MT 49:13 has been explained as a case of dittography from the preceding לחרפה (so Ehrlich, p. 87, Rudolph, p. 288, and Ziegler, *Beiträge*, p. 87; cf. the apparent confusion of לחרבות and לחרפה in 25:9⁵¹), or even from לחרבות of the following clause (so Bright, p. 329; Volz, p. 320, entertains both possibilities). Janzen (p. 25) is aware of Ziegler's decision in favour of dittography and considers this explanation "plausible", but adds, "or § may be just expanding the series, as elsewhere". His remark on the same passage on p. 59, # 182 quoted above clearly shows where his preference lies (i.e. in favour of expansion).

We cannot share this preference. If it had been a case of "filling out", we would naturally have expected the same form (חרבה) as used elsewhere to have been employed in this instance also. The anomalous form, therefore, is an argument against it being a case of "filling out". If the secondary status of לחרב be insisted upon, then the explanation of scribal dittography seems the best one available. It may be inquired,

however, whether too much has been made of the difference between
 לַחַרְבִּי and the other terms employed in the series. Perhaps
 MT 49:13 could be read in the form

לַשְׂמָה לַחַרְבִּי
 לַחַרְבִּי וְלַקִּלְלָה

where לַשְׂמָה and לַחַרְבִּי are deliberately balanced by לַחַרְבִּי
 and לַקִּלְלָה, the first pair being taken as representing
 concrete, visible results, the second pair as representing abstract,
 moral states. If so, this could constitute an argument for not
 surrendering לַחַרְבִּי too easily. The Heb Vorlage of the LXX could
 presumably have been short by haplography; if לַחַרְבִּי and לַחַרְבִּי
 are similar enough to have occasioned dittography, the same argu-
 ment must hold for the case of haplography. But it cannot be
 affirmed that the evidence is conclusive either way.⁵²

Conclusion

There is no standard number of terms in the series considered,
 and a shorter Gk text cannot be taken as a sure witness to the
 original length of the series. Each variant has to be examined
 on its own merits. Sometimes this examination yields a preference
 for the Gk text, sometimes for the Heb, sometimes it is impossible
 to decide between them. Janzen oversimplifies the solution by
 repeatedly appealing to parallel and related contexts as the expla-
 nation for the longer Heb text. The data considered in this sec-
 tion does not readily admit of such generalizations.

Other coordinated series in Jer present the same kind of
 problems as those found here, e.g. the triad חַרְבַּ רַעַב דָּבָר
 ("der erstaunlich abweichenden Bezeugung der Trias im MT im Ver-
 gleich mit LXX" --Weippert, p. 150). In deciding in favour of
 the shorter Gk series (where it occurs), Janzen (pp. 43-44) appeals
 to "the general tendency" of the MT to expand. Again, it is pre-
 cisely this kind of generalization that we consider illegitimate
 and have found inappropriate for describing the texts of Jer.

29:18(49:17)

καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἰδουμαία εἰς ἄβαν, והיתה אדום לשמה

πᾶς ὁ παραπορευόμενος ἐπ' αὐτῆς כל עבר עליה

συριεῖ ישם וישרק על כל מכותיה

συριεῖ B-S-130-538 A-106' L^a ...] ἐκστῆσεται (pr. συριεῖ C) καὶ συριεῖ ἐπὶ (εν 87^{ext}) παση τη πληγῇ (πασαν την πληγην Q-239-613) αὐτης rel.

There exist seven close parallels to this verse, four outside the book of Jer (1 Ki 9:8 // 2 Chr 7:21, Zeph 3:1(MT 2:15), Lam 2:15) and three within (18:16, 19:8, 27(50):13). According to Janzen (pp. 59-60), the readings ושם and כל מכותיה of Jer MT 49:17 are secondary expansions from 19:8 and 50:13. In order to evaluate this position it will be necessary to review all the relevant passages.

1 Ki 9:8

καὶ ὁ οἶκος οὗτος ὁ ὑψηλός, והבית הזה יהיה עליון

πᾶς ὁ διαπορευόμενος δι' αὐτοῦ כל עבר עליו

ἐκστήσεται καὶ συριεῖ ישם ושרק

2 Chr 7:21

καὶ ὁ οἶκος οὗτος ὁ ὑψηλός, והבית הזה אשר היה עליון

πᾶς ὁ διαπορευόμενος αὐτὸν לכל עבר עליו

ἐκστήσεται ישם

Zeph 3:1(2:15)

πῶς ἐγενήθη εἰς ἀφανισμόν,

איד היתה לשמה

νομή θηρίων.

מרבץ לחיה

πᾶς ὁ διαπορευόμενος δι' αὐτῆς

כל עובר עליה

συριεῖ καὶ κινήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ

ישרק ויניע ידו

Lam 2:15

Ἐκρότησαν ἐπὶ σε χεῖρας

פפרקו עליך כפיים

πάντες οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ὁδόν,

כל עברי דרך

ἐσύρισαν καὶ ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν

שרקו וינעו ראשם

ἐπὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Ἱερουσαλὴμ

על בת ירושלם

Jer 18:16

τοῦ τᾶξαι τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀφανισμόν ὡς ἡ

καὶ σύριγμα αἰώνιον,

שרוקת עולם

πάντες οἱ διαπορευόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς

כל עובר עליה

ἐκστήσεται καὶ κινήσουσι τὴν
κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν

ישם ויניד בראשו

Jer 19:8

καὶ κατατάξω τὴν πόλιν ταύτην

ושמהתי את העיר הזאת

εἰς ἀφανισμόν καὶ εἰς συριγμόν.

לשמה ולשרקה

πᾶς ὁ παραπορευόμενος ἐπ' αὐτῆς

כל עבר עליה

σκυθρωπάσει καὶ συριεῖ

ישם וישרק

ὕπὲρ πᾶσης τῆς πληγῆς αὐτῆς

על כל מכותיה

Jer 27(50):13

καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἀφανισμόν πᾶσα,

והיתה שמה כלה

καὶ πᾶς ὁ διοδεύων διὰ Βαβυλῶνος

כל עבר על בבל

σκυθρωπάσει καὶ συριοῦσιν

ישם וישרק

ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν αὐτῆς

על כל מכותיה

It is quite clear that the above passages constitute a stereotyped prophetic saying, the common element to each being the pivotal כל עבר construction in the middle of the sentence. In all Heb passages except 2 Chr 7:21, the כל עבר phrase is followed by two verbs expressing horror at the devastation viewed. The verb-pairs in question are שם / שרק (1 Ki 9:8, Jer 19:8, 49:17, 50:13), שם / נוע (Jer 18:6), and שרק / נוע (Zeph 2:15, Lam 2:15). In the MT of Jer 19:8, 49:17, and 50:13, the saying is concluded by the phrase כל מכותיה. The fact that these three Jer passages have the same verb-pairs and conclude in identical fashion is evidence of their close literary connexion.

But in Jer 29:18(49:17) the situation is complicated by the omission in the LXX of any word corresponding to the Heb verb

וְשׁ and the phrase כָּל מִכּוֹתָהּ, whereas in all other passages the LXX consistently supports the MT. Janzen takes the shorter LXX of this phrase as the original reading and regards the literary parallelism existing between MT 49:17 on the one hand and MT 19:8 and 50:13 on the other hand as a case of secondary expansion in the former. But this explanation is highly unsatisfactory. It is virtually certain that the original composition of MT 49:17 must have contained two verbs, not one, in conformity with all the other Heb passages except 2 Chr 7:21. But the case of the single verb in 2 Chr 7:21 reinforces rather than weakens the priority of the two-verb pattern, for it is obvious that in this case it is the Chronicler or his Vorlage that has shortened the original form as found in 1 Ki 9:8 (see the discussion on this point by I.L. Seeligman, VT 11 (1961), 205-6). Similarly in Jer 49:17 we must hold that the original form of the clause contained both verbs, one of which was omitted by the translator or was already missing in his Vorlage. To put it the other way around: the presence of וְשׁ in the MT of 49:17 is no more a case of secondary expansion than is the presence of קָרַע in 1 Ki 9:8.

In order to support his position that the LXX is the earlier text at 29:18(49:17), Janzen comments (p. 60), "That the cliché

קָרַע וְשָׂם עָלֶיהָ עֵבֶר כָּל may occur with only one of the verbs is shown by 18.16, Zeph. 2.15". Certainly it is true that in Jer 18:16 and Zeph 2:15 only one of the particular pair וְשָׂם / קָרַע occurs (וְשָׂם and קָרַע respectively); but the point is quite irrelevant. It remains true that in each case it is pair-verbs that are used, even though the actual verbs composing these pairs may vary; this is the decisive point.

Although no similar concrete evidence is available by which to judge the lack of a corresponding Gk phrase for כָּל מִכּוֹתָהּ

וְשָׂם in 29:18(49:17), one suspects that the LXX is no more to be trusted here than in the case of the omission of וְשָׂם. Cross-fertilization from the parallel passages of 19:8 and 50:13 is certainly a possibility to be reckoned with, but since the verb pairs employed were originally identical there is no reason for

supposing that they should not have been completed in the same way by the phrase $\eta \tau(\nu) > \mu \lambda > \lambda$. Why it should have been omitted by the translator or was already missing in his Vorlage exceeds the capabilities of our critical methods to determine.

29:22(49:21)

ὅτι ἀπὸ φωνῆς πτώσεως αὐτῶν

חֲקִיל נִכְלָם

ἐφοβήθη ἡ γῆ,

רַעְשָׁה הָאָרֶץ

καὶ κραυγὴ θαλάσσης οὐκ ἠκούσθη

צַעֲקָה בַּיָּם סוּף נִשְׁמָע
קוֹלָהּ

ἠκούσθη] + ἡ φωνὴ αὐτῆς (σου $\zeta\eta\lambda\omega$) 0 ; + φωνή
(pr. η 51-62-311-407-449) σου L Arm

In the Gk of this verse there is no equivalent for the MT reading $\eta \lambda \iota \kappa$. This "zero variant" is not dealt with by Janzen, somewhat surprisingly since a rather strong case can be made on behalf of the LXX possessing a shorter and better text at this point.⁵³ As it stands, the MT of the phrase at the end of which comes $\eta \lambda \iota \kappa$ makes for awkward syntax indeed. Various translations have been attempted to accommodate the presence of both Heb words $\eta \rho \alpha \nu$ and $\eta \lambda \iota \kappa$, the most literal of which (RV) has, "there is a cry, the noise whereof is heard in the Red Sea" (similarly NASB). Others, pointing $\eta \rho \alpha \nu$ as a verb, propose, "it cries out, and the cry is heard at the Red Sea" (NEB, cf. JB). Yet most commentators are generally agreed that $\eta \lambda \iota \kappa$ is to be deleted. In this judgement we concur.

The authority for deleting $\eta \lambda \iota \kappa$ on this occasion is the united testimony of the LXX and the parallel passage of 27(50):46, the latter of which reads:

ὅτι ἀπὸ φωνῆς ἀλώσεως βαβυλῶνος

מקול נחפשה בבל

σεισθήσεται ἡ γῆ,

נרנשה הארץ

καὶ κραυγὴ ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἀκουσθήσεται

וזעקה כגוים נשמע

One would have been reluctant to trust the LXX on its own (it may simply have omitted an awkward word), but in conjunction with the witness of the parallel passage and in view of the difficult Heb syntax resulting from the presence of מקול, we can accept the LXX here as a testimony to a better text.

How then is מקול to be regarded? Originally it was probably a textual variant to קוצץ; in the process of transmission it became drawn into the text at the end of the colon. Volz (p. 321) has a somewhat more complicated explanation, namely that קוצץ originally stood where מקול now stands but that it fell out of the text and was replaced by מקול; when קוצץ was again recovered it had to give way to the presence of מקול at the end of the phrase and hence was introduced at the beginning instead. Such speculation is tolerable but somewhat superfluous. However, Volz' statement that "Die zwei Substantiva קוצץ und מקול im gleichen Satz vertragen sich nicht" remains true, and the deletion of מקול finds genuine support here from the omission of a corresponding word in the LXX.

29:23a(49:22a)

ἰδοὺ ὡς περ ἀστὸς ὄψεται

הנה כנשר יעלה וידמה

καὶ ἐκτενεί τὰς πτέρυγας

ויפרש כנפיו

ἐπ' ὀχυρώματα αὐτῆς

על בארה

ὄψεται] αναβησεται και επιστησεται (επιπτησεται 51-51'-62-407-449) L

In the first line of this verse, the LXX is twice at odds with the MT: the translation ὁψεται for MT הִנֵּה and the omission of a corresponding Gk word for הִנֵּה. The former is easily explained as resulting from an interchange of ט/ח in הִנֵּה,⁵⁴ either already in the translator's Vorlage or because he did not know the meaning of the uncommon verb הִנֵּה.⁵⁵ The omission of a word for הִנֵּה is less easily disposed of.

In favour of the secondary status of הִנֵּה is the parallel passage of MT 48:40 הִנֵּה כֹּשֶׁר יִדְּהָה which also is without the verb הִנֵּה. Thus Ziegler (Beiträge, p. 87) calls הִנֵּה a doublet of the type that should have been in the apparatus to BH as "dittogr." Janzen (p. 25) considers this explanation "plausible, but unsure". It is indeed difficult to follow Ziegler here as there is nothing immediately preceding or following הִנֵּה which remotely resembles the word. Bright (p. 330) and Christensen (pp. 239-40) take the two verbs הִנֵּה and יִדְּהָה as variant readings which have been conflated in the MT. Hitzig (p. 369) and Duhm (p. 357) derive הִנֵּה from the somewhat similar phrase of v. 19 הִנֵּה כֹּשֶׁר יִדְּהָה. On the assumption that הִנֵּה is indeed secondary, it seems to us that the last mentioned possibility has most in its favour and it is surprising that this example is not mentioned by Janzen in his chapter on "Additions from Parallel and Related Contexts" especially since it has more in its favour than many of the examples included by him there.

Still, an absolute verdict is impossible. A very similar set of problems is encountered in the Heb and Gk versions of the parallel passages 29:9(49:8) and 30:8(49:30), set out below:

29:9(49:8)

ἡπατήθη ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν

וְהָיָה

βαθύνετε εἰς κάθισιν

וְהָיָה לְשִׁבְתָּם

30:8(49:30)

φεύγετε λίαν

תנח 171 101

βαθύνετε εἰς κάθισιν

תבש 171 101

The textual problem in the difficult Gk translation of 29:9(49:8), ἡ πατήθη ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν, have been discussed in Ch. 3 (pp. 165-167), but we assume the original Heb read much as we find it in MT, 171 101. In the parallel passage of 30:8(49:30), however, the verbs employed are 171 101, but the Gk omits the second of these. As with 171 of MT 49:22, so here Ziegler calls 171 a case of dittography (Beiträge, p. 87) which Janzen (p. 25) again calls "plausible, but unsure". At least on this occasion there is more transcriptional possibility in Ziegler's suggestion, 101 and 171 being orthographically related. However, there is also here the possibility that 101 of MT 49:30 should have come from MT 49:8, just as 171 of 49:22 may have derived from MT 49:19. In the end we will probably have to plead ignorance on the reason for the discrepant readings here discussed. However, of one thing we are quite sure, namely that a solution to these individual problems is not to be found in any general theory either of expansion or contraction of texts. Such generalizations we have not found to be applicable to our texts.

29:23(49:22) // 31(48):40b,41b

In this section we will study the parallel verses 29:23(49:22) and 31(48):40b,41b as examples of the phenomenon of duplicate passages in Jer.

29:23(49:22)

ἰδοὺ ὡς περ ἄστρος ὄψεται

הנה כנשר יעלה וידאה

καὶ ἐκτενεί τὰς πτέρυγας ἐπ' ὀχυρώματα αὐτῆς.

ויפרש כנפיו על בצרה

καὶ ἔσται ἡ καρδία τῶν ἰσχυρῶν τῆς Ἰδουμαίας

והיה לב גבורי אדום

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ὡς καρδία

ביום ההוא כלב

γυναικὸς ὠδινούσης.

אשה מצרה

31(48):40-41

ὅτι οὕτως εἶπε κύριος

כִּי כה אמר יהוה

הנה כנשר ידאה

ופרש כנפיו אל מואב

(v.41) Ἐλήμφθη Ακκερων

נלכדה הקריות

καὶ τὰ ὀχυρώματα συνελήμφθη

והמצדות נתפשה

והיה לב גבורי מואב

ביום ההוא כלב אשה מצרה

κύριος] + (·x·O) ἰδου ως αστρος ορμησει και εκτετασει
 χειρας (τας πτερυγας L Th^t = 29:23) αὐτου επι μωαβ
 O L C Ar^m Th^t

συνελήμφθη] + (·x·O) και εσται η καρδια των (>O) δυνατων
 μωαβ εν τη ημερα εκεινη ως καρδια γυναικος
 ωδινουσης O L C (om. των δυν.) Ar^m

In the last five verses of the Edom oracle there are three clear examples of duplicate passages within Jer: 29:19(49:18) // 27(50):40, 29:20-22(49:19-21) // 27(50):44-46, and the one quoted above. In the first two pairs the Gk consistently attests the Heb on each occurrence, but in 29:23(49:22) // 31(48):40b,41b the Gk omits the second occurrence of the Heb duplicate. This pattern of sometimes attesting, sometimes omitting one of the members of a Heb pair is typical of the LXX of this book. Janzen believes that duplicate passages in Jer unattested by the Gk are further examples of expansion from parallel contexts (p. 96), though in the case of the duplicate in MT 48:40b,41b he has a special explanation of how the passage from MT 49:22 came to appear just here, namely as a gloss originally on הַרְגוּ in MT 48:24 which was later taken into the wrong column of the MS with appropriate change of names (p. 59).

The aberrant translation pattern in the LXX of the Heb duplicate passages provided the springboard for the first systematic treatment of the Gk and Heb texts of this book, namely that by M.G.L. Spohn in 1794. In the opening pages of his work Spohn identified 25 of these doublets, six or seven of which in their second occurrence were absent from the Gk text. To account for this phenomenon, Spohn posited the theory that the translator was a private individual who chose not to translate a second time what he already had translated once, even though, for various reasons, he was frequently inconsistent in the execution of his plan.

This theory of the deliberate omission in the Gk text of the second occurrence of a Heb duplicate passage has had popular currency among commentators even till recent times. Thus Bright (p. cxxiii) remarks that the "LXX habitually omits doublets on their second occurrence" (similarly p. lxxv), and Weiser (p. 401, n. 3) on the Gk omission at 31(48):40b,41b comments, "Das Fehlen in G erklärt sich daraus, dass in der Septuaginta 49,22 (=G 29,23) dem Moabspruch (=G Kap. 31) vorausgeht, und eine Wiederholung in 48,40 vermieden wurde" (cf. Bright, p. 321). But this theory will not stand scrutiny.

As Janzen has pointed out (pp. 91ff.), the chief objection to a theory of the deliberate omission of the second occurrence of a duplicate passage is the number of times both parts are in fact attested in the Gk. While it is possible to document the omission of the second occurrence of the following seven doublets, 6:13-15 // 8:10b-12, 7:24-26 (or alternately 11:3ff.) // 11:7-8, 15:13-14 // 17:3-4, 16:14-15 // 23:7-8,⁵⁶ 24:8-10 // 29:16-18, 46:27-28 // 30:10-11, 49:22 // 48:40b,41b,⁵⁷ it is noteworthy that on twice as many occasions both occurrences of the doublet are attested.⁵⁸ Spohn tried to account for this lack of consistency by suggesting that sometimes the translator simply forgot what he had already translated once, sometimes the omission of a duplicate passage would seriously disrupt the context and was therefore retained, and at least on one occasion (29:20-21(49:19-20) // 27 (50):44-45) the second passage may have been rendered by a different translator from the first. But such arguments seem frankly artificial.

In his discussion of the seven passages which are commonly cited as evidence for the theory of deliberate omission, Janzen eliminates two from further consideration on the ground that they can be satisfactorily explained by haplography either in the Gk or in its Heb Vorlage, leaving five for more detailed treatment. In each case Janzen's intention is to show that the "omitted" Gk passages were not originally present in the translator's Vorlage but that they were added at a later stage from parallel and related contexts.

The two points are, however, not one and the same. On the first--the omission of the passage in the translator's Vorlage--we find the discussion generally convincing. Particular mention may be made of argument on the basis of internal Gk syntax against the presence in the Heb Vorlage of 8:10b-12 (p. 95) and 23:7-8, at least in its present MT position (p. 93). Likewise to the point are his remarks on the absence in the Moab oracle, 31(48):40b, 41b, of the duplicate passage from the Edom oracle, 29:23(49:22): "We cannot believe that the translator, having translated the couplet already in 49:22, was so concerned to avoid repetition

of doublets that he would go to the trouble to ferret the parallel lines from their interwoven context and excise them, only to translate several large doublets and scores of smaller ones, too indifferent or careless in his method to notice that he had already translated them once before". In these cases we accept that it is much easier to believe that the duplicates in question were missing in the translator's Vorlage than that they were deliberately omitted by him.

However, when it comes to actually explaining the presence of the MT passages where they are missing in the Gk we are less confident in following Janzen. In fact, this part of his discussion is as unconvincing as the former was convincing. For illustration we may turn again to his discussion of the omissions of 8:10b-12 and 23:7-8 in the paragraphs commencing "We propose . . ." on pp. 95-6, 93 respectively. These paragraphs contain intriguing proposals for reconstructing the original form of the passage in question, but in the end they amount only to speculative theories which are beyond evidential control. The same goes for his suggestion on how the passage from MT 49:22 found its way secondarily into MT 48:40b, 41b, i.e., via a gloss on הַיְּהוּדִים at 48:24 which was later taken into the wrong column of the MS with appropriate change in name. The proposal is not without its touch of brilliance, but when all is said and done, it remains a creation of the imagination without basis in fact. What is objectionable about these reconstructions is that they all proceed on the same premise, namely that where the LXX omits a duplicate passage this must be a testimony to the primary character of the Gk Vorlage. In certain passages this may well be the case, but it ought to be the result rather than a premise of the discussion. Janzen comes to these doublets with his conviction regarding the generally expansionist character of MT (p. 96, ll. 19-20) and interprets the aberrant Gk translation pattern of Heb duplicates accordingly. The circular nature of this reasoning is obvious.

In the case of the Edom/Moab duplicate which we have been considering, we believe it is practically impossible to pronounce a final verdict on why the Gk omits the parallel portion.

Probability certainly lies with its omission in the Heb Vorlage but that only throws the question back one: why was it missing in the Vorlage? Most commentators take the view expressed by Janzen that the passage is primary in the Edom oracle and secondary in the Moab oracle, according to the LXX. But the subjective nature of these judgments is shown by the completely opposite conclusion arrived at by Volz (pp. 314ff.), namely that the passage is primary in the Moab oracle (against the LXX) and secondary in the Edom oracle (in spite of LXX). Then, of course, there are those who regard it as primary in both places, e.g. Weiser. Therefore we come to the conclusion, that in the absence of any decisive evidence preferring one text above the other, as commentators and text-critics we have to stay with the MT as the best witness available to the earliest recoverable form of our Moab oracle at MT 48:40-41.

III. Conclusion

In the introductory chapter to Janzen's book we were confronted with the two leading questions motivating the study, viz, whether the Gk text bears witness to a deliberately abbreviated translation or to an existing shorter Heb Vorlage than the MT, and, if the latter, whether this shorter Vorlage also represents a superior text to that of the MT. The author's answer to these questions is that, except in those cases where the Gk is not demonstrably short by scribal lapse, the LXX goes back to a Heb text which is both shorter and superior to that of the MT (cf. pp. 128, 135). The hypothesis of translator abridgement, the author believes, should be abandoned once for all (p. 115), thus closing one long-standing debate about the text of Jer (p. 128). But not only is the "abbreviation" theory rejected; also discounted is the "mediating" position of scholars like Rudolph, Hyatt, and Bright who have resisted attempts to generalize regarding the relative merits of variant readings in the two texts. By contrast, Janzen affirms that generalizations about the character of the texts are valid, specifically that the MT consistently represents a late, developed tradition. In short, Janzen's study

constitutes a determined modern apology on behalf of the "expansion" theory. The "modern" aspect of the work is highlighted in a concluding section where the results are tentatively accommodated to the larger theory of local texts formulated by Prof. Cross, according to which three centres of Jewish learning--the Babylonian, Palestinian, and Egyptian--were predominant in the preservation of the Hebrew scriptures. On this scheme, the MT is said to represent the Palestinian tradition--generally characterized by expansion and conflation--while the Heb underlying the LXX of Jer represents the Egyptian tradition, which, having survived in isolation from ca. 450-350 B.C. had escaped the Palestinian affinity for expansion.

While welcoming Janzen's fresh investigation of the Heb/Gk problem and recognizing many points of value in it,⁵⁹ our own review of a small portion of the text has failed to provide convincing support for the broad conclusions advanced by Janzen. Evidence of various types, both direct and indirect, do point to the existence at one time of a Heb text shorter than the MT, and we can be grateful to Janzen for having brought this issue into focus. However, the author is often too quick to generalize and simply to assume a shorter Vorlage. Failure to take account of translation phenomena and contextual considerations undermine the arguments for a ubiquitously shorter Heb Vorlage than the MT.

A more important point has to do with the writer's inclination to assume that wherever an argument can be advanced for a shorter Vorlage than the MT that this also represents a superior Vorlage to the MT. The two questions of length and superiority ought to be held apart and the issues not blurred. Yet such blurring of the issues is precisely what we find in the summary paragraph on p. 128 where evidence for a lack of translator abridgement in the LXX is tacitly taken as evidence for a superior Heb text. Yet the one (a shorter Vorlage) does not necessarily imply the other (a superior Vorlage). Here, too, we have not found that generalizations of the kind proffered by Janzen can be sustained.

While one feels the inherent attractiveness of broad

generalizations that in one sweep can solve a multitude of textual conundrums, one must resist the temptation to yield to such generalizations where they do not stand up to close scrutiny. The temptation must be resisted even if in the process it makes the task of the Jer student more rather than less difficult. At the same time it is important not to lose one's perspective: whether in the longer or shorter version, the book of Jer still speaks to us with power and conviction which should not be obscured in the course of an otherwise legitimate and necessary text-critical enterprise.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. For an interesting review of the use made of the Jeremiah tradition in early Judaism and Christianity see the recent study by C. Wolff, Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum, Berlin, 1976.

2. Such at least is the traditional picture of the origin and growth of the LXX drawn by H.B. Swete (Introduction, pp. 1-28) and H. St. J. Thackeray (ISBE, IV, 2722 ff.; Jewish Worship, pp. 10-11) and often repeated in handbooks and articles. In a recent contribution, E. Tov has cautioned against too readily assuming a connexion between Alexandria and the translation of the non-pentateuchal books of the LXX ("The Nature of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX", JSOT 7 (1978), esp. pp. 53-54).

3. Little work has been done on the relative dating of the various books comprising the LXX, but see the remarks by Thackeray in ISBE, IV, 2730, and in Jewish Worship, p. 28. For a helpful summary of Thackeray's views on the internal dating of the books see Jellicoe, SMS, pp. 64-70, esp. p. 67. Mention could also be made in this connexion of the article by H.A. Redpath, "Contributions Towards Settling the Date of the Translation of the Various Books of the Septuagint", JTS 7 (1906), 606-615.

4. τὸ "πρῶτον" εἶτε μὴ νοήσαντες ἐξεῖλάν τινες τῶν γεγραμμένων εἶτε καὶ οἰκονομήσαντες ἐξεῖλκιν οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα, θεὸς ἂν εἰδείη, GCS, Origenes III, p. 137.

5. Cf. in the first apparatus of Ziegler's edition the appropriate quotes at 15:19, 17:26, 18:13, 28:44, 30:10, 34:2, 37:6, and 38:2.

6. The idea that the Sixtine edition was dependent on the Aldine was first mooted by Paul de Lagarde (Mittheilungen, I, 123) and has since been confirmed by the studies of A. Rahlfs ("Die Abhängigkeit der sixtinischen Septuaginta-Ausgabe von der aldinischen", ZAW 33 (1913), 30-46), M.L. Margolis ("The Aldina as a Source for the Sixtine", JBL 38 (1919), 51-52), and J. Ziegler ("Der Text der Aldina im Dodekapropheten", Biblica 26 (1945), 37-51, esp. 49-51).

7. For background information to the publication history of both the smaller and larger Cambridge editions see H.B. Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, I, xi; Introduction, pp. 188-190; as well as the "Prefatory Note to Genesis" in BM, I, 1906, i-v, and "Preface to the Octateuch", I, 1917, v-vii.

8. Cf. his remarks in Anmerkungen, p. 3 (Mitt. I, 21), "Noch einmal", (Mitt. III, 230-231), and Pars prior, p. xvi.

9. For useful summaries on the history and objectives of the Göttingen series see the articles by W. Kappler ("Ziele und Aufgaben des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens", GGA 202 (1940), R. Hanhart ("L'edizione dei LXX e la fondazione Göttingense che la prepara" RivStorLettRel 1 (1965), 351-352), and J. W. Wevers ("The Göttingen Septuagint", IOSCS Bulletin 8 (1975), 19-23).

10. Ieremias Vates e versione Ioudaeorum Alexandrinorum ac reliquorum interpretum graecorum emendatus notisque criticis illustratus, 2 volumes, Leipzig, 1824 ("Tomus 2 post obitum patris edidit, F.G.A. Spohn").

11. Das Buch Jeremia griechisch und hebräisch (Nach dem Tode des Herausgebers besorgt von J. Dahse und Erwin Nestle), Stuttgart, 1924.

12. For instance, the title page now prints the name as Jeremias with a "J" instead of with an "I" as in the first edition (this produces an inconsistency, however, since the name remains as "Ieremias" at the top of every page of the text). For other slight changes in the new edition see the discussion below in Ch. 3, pp. 132-133.

13. In Colligere Fragmenta (FS Alban Dold), eds. B. Fischer and V. Fiala (Texte und Arbeiten 2), Beuron, 1952, pp. 13-24.

14. Historisches Jahrbuch 77 (1958), 347-357.

15. The quote comes from M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice", Textus 3 (1963), 149, n. 70. Note also the recent comment by B. Childs in Old Testament Books for Pastor and Teacher, Philadelphia, 1977, pp. 15-16, to the effect that he prefers "the very useful" edition of Swete in favour of "the eclectic text" of Rahlfs.

16. See the statement recorded above (p.4) from the Cambridge University Reporter, 13 March, 1883, particularly the comment that the apparatus of the larger edition would "provide materials for the critical determination of the text". Swete remarks that the collation of HP "promise materials upon which a critical revision of the text may ultimately be based" (OT in Greek, I, ix), and with regard to his own edition he feels that a reliable reproduction of Codex Vaticanus "supplies at least an excellent standard of comparison, . . . until a critical text has been produced (Introduction, p. 190). According to their "Prefatory Note to Genesis", Brooke and McLean say that their object is to present "the evidence available for the reconstruction of the text or texts of the LXX" (BM, I, 1, i).

17. See the remark in "Prefatory Note to Genesis" on Lagarde: "He alone, if any one, could have 'sustained the labour,' --not only of the preliminary task which has been entrusted to us, but also of its more important sequel--the reconstruction of the pre-hexaplaric text of the LXX., so far as that is now possible" (p. iv). Compare also Swete's remarks on Lagarde, Introduction p. 288 and OT in Greek, I, x.

18. Again in the "Prefatory Note to Genesis" note the statement, "At an early stage of the undertaking it was decided that it would be premature to attempt to provide a reconstructed or 'true' text in this edition". Similarly in the "Preface to the Octateuch" (1917), "No attempt has been made to provide a reconstructed or 'true' Septuagint text. As Dr Deissmann said at the Oriental Congress at Hamburg when the plan of our edition was discussed, 'In the present state of LXX studies an edition of the LXX in the strict sense of the word is not yet possible. What however is possible and absolutely necessary is a trustworthy collection of the textual material.' The work originally undertaken by the Syndics of the Press in 1883 was based on the same view. In preparing the present volume we have come across no evidence of any sort which has led us to modify our belief in its absolute truth". See also Swete on Tischendorf: "It was plain to him that the time had not come for the construction of a critical text", OT in Greek, I, ix.

19. E.g., G. Lambert, Nouvelle Revue Théologique 80 (1958), 990.

B. Botte, Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale 25 (1958), 147-148.

R. Tournay, RB 65 (1958), 292.

O. Eissfeldt, TLZ 83 (1958), 22-24.

H. Schneider, TRe 65 (1960), 101-106.

20. This remains the clearest example of the change of style in the second half even though the actual phrase οὐτως, εἰς κέρως, occurs for the first time only in 30:1.

21. Already in 1794 M.G.L. Spohn suggested that the different versions of the parallel passage in 29:19-20 (49:18-19) // 27(50):44-45 implied different hands Ieremias vates (published 1824), pp. 9-10 (cf. also pp. 17, 20). See also the remarks by P.F. Frankl (1872), pp. 448-449, A. Scholz (1875), p. 14, C. Workman (1889), p. xxvii, A.W. Streane (1896), p. 1, n. 1, and J.J. Kneucker (1879), p. 83, n. 8. Only E. Kuhl (1882) made an explicit statement to the effect that the translation of Jer was a unity (p. 8).

22. "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", JTS 4 (1902-03), 245-266; Jewish Worship, pp. 29-37.

23. "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 4 (1902-03), 398-411; "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books", JTS 4 (1902-03), 578-585; "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings", JTS 8 (1906-07), 262-278.

24. See for example the contributions by:

G. Buchanan Gray, "The Greek Version of Isaiah: Is it the Work of a Single Translator?", JTS 12 (1911), 286-293.

J. Herrmann and F. Baumgartel, Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta, 1923.

O.J. Baab, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis", JBL 52 (1933), 239-243.

N. Turner, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 7 (1956), 12-24.

M.S. Hurwitz, "The Septuagint of Isaiah 36-39 in Relation to that of 1-35, 40-66", HUCA 28 (1957), 75-83.

G. Howard, "Some Notes on the Septuagint of Amos", VT 20 (1970), 108-112.

T. Muraoka, "A Re-examination of the Two-translator Theory of a Septuagint Book", unpublished paper read at Uppsala International meeting IOSCS, 1971.

T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity", 1972 Proceedings, 1972 90-107.

J.A. Arieti, "The Vocabulary of Septuagint Amos", JBL 93 (1974), 338-347.

25. "The Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies", JAOS 61 (1941), 88, n. 31.

26. See for example the critiques by:

A. Kaminka, Studien zur Septuaginta, 1928, p. 9.

J. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, 1934, pp. 31-46.

J. Ziegler, Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch, 1934-35, pp. 1-16.

J. Ziegler, "Der textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job", Miscellanea Biblica, II, 277-296, 1934.

A.C. Johnson, H.S. Gehman, E.H. Kase, The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel, 1938, pp. 52-73.

I.L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah, 1948, pp. 39-42.

D.W. Gooding, The Account of the Tabernacle, 1959. The book argues for a unity in the translation of the LXX of Exodus, except for Ex 38 which comes from a different hand (cf. Chs. 4-7 of the book).

T. Muraoka, "Is the Septuagint Amos VIII 12-IX 10 a Separate Unit?" VT 20 (1970), 496-500.

D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila, 1963, pp. 91ff.

27. Some representative examples are the following:

E. Duval, "Le texte grec de Jérémie d'après une étude récente", RB 12 (1903), 394-403.

L. Köhler, "Beobachtungen", ZAW 29 (1909), 1-39, esp. p. 5, n. 4.

W.W. Graf von Baudissin, Kyrios, 1929, I, 191, n. 1.

R.A. Martin, Syntax, 1957, p. 7.

W. Rudolph, Jeremia, 1968, p. xxiii.

E. Würthwein, Der Text des Alten Testaments, 1966, p. 53, n. 1.

28. Ziegler says, "Bei der Untersuchung des Übersetzungscharakters ist zu beachten, dass die Ier.-LXX nicht einheitlich ist. Dies haben schon ältere Textkritiker bemerkt, so Spohn. Thackeray nimmt zwei Übersetzer an Mann muss Thack. zustimmen" Ieremias, p. 128, n. 1. In Beiträge he speaks for instance of "dem zweiten Ier.-Übersetzer", pp. 28-29 and passim.

29. See K.H. Graf, 1862, pp. xl ff., and F. Giesebrecht, 1907, pp. xxvff. For a list of the major LXX omissions see A. Gelin, Dictionnaire de la Bible, IV, col. 857ff.

30. MT order: Egypt, Philistines, Moab, Ammonites, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Elam, Babylon. LXX order: Elam, Egypt, Babylon, Philistines, Edom, Ammonites, Kedar, Damascus, Moab.

31. Ziegler thinks that this phrase has reference not only to the large transpositions of the oracles but also to the many differences in word order between the LXX and MT texts (Ieremias, p. 44, n.1).

32. "They [i.e. the Jewish elders] hid from the knowledge of the people as many of the passages which contained any scandal against the elders, rulers, and judges, as they could, some of which have been preserved in uncanonical writings (Apocrypha)" Ante-Nicene Library, X, p. 377 (in Gk, PG 11).

33. GCS, Origenes X, p. 388. See quote in translation below, p. 56.

34. E.g. HTR 57 (1964), esp. 287 (n. 28), 298-299; IEJ 16 (1966), esp. 82 (n. 6), 84-85, 92-93 (n. 36), 94; "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts", QHBT, esp. pp. 308-309.

35. E.g. RB 81 (1974), 631 (F.L.); CBQ 38 (1976), 109-110 (R.W. Klein); JJS 28 (1977), 198 (P. Wernberg-Møller); SOTS Book List, 1975, pp. 35-36 (W. McKane). Two extended reviews--both critical--are those by G.F. Hasel in Bibliotheca Orientalis 32 (1975), 236-238, and M. Dahood in Biblica 56 (1975), 429-431.

36. The closest approximation in the field of LXX to this method that I have found is the work by J.C.M. das Neves, A teologia da tradução grega dos Setenta no livro de Isaías, Lisbon, 1973, where he takes Ch. 24 as a test-case for exploring the theological tendencies of the LXX version of Isaiah. The method has also been used with profit in various book reviews, e.g. the review of L.H. Brockington The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament (Bibliotheca Orientalis 32 (1975), 84-85) where the reviewer evaluates the book on the basis of Gen 49.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. A number of MSS listed by Ziegler (Ieremias, pp. 8-10) are incomplete or fragmentary and do not contain Ch. 29; these are 147, 198, 231, 393, 445, 449, 456, 567, 951, 966, 980.

An additional nine MSS exist which do contain the text of Jer 29 but have not been collated for this study; these are 97, 228, 420, 430, 435, 461, 501, 568, 684. These late and less important minuscules were among those not collated for the Göttingen edition of Jer; they were therefore not included in their photograph-microfilm collection and consequently were unavailable to me during my visit there. MSS 97 (known in HP and Nestle-Dahse by the number 33) and 228 were collated by HP (from whence they were taken over by Nestle-Dahse). These two, along with 430, 435, and 568, and "Catena" MSS and contain the same type of text as that described below in the section on the C group (pp. 91-96). MSS 420 and 501 are dependent on 631 and 36 respectively, both of which have been collated for our study.

Ziegler (p. 11) also lists MSS 349, 533, and 573 as containing Jer texts but this information is incorrect according to Rahlfs' Verzeichnis. The MSS in question are indeed Catena texts as noted by Ziegler, but they do not contain the book of Jer (cf. Rahlfs, Verzeichnis, p. 26, pp. 186-7, p. 205).

Another MS collated by HP (followed by Nestle-Dahse) is 41, but this MS according to Rahlfs' Verzeichnis is one of those which is "vorschollen".

2. In the collation of HP the codex is cited by the abbreviation "Alex" (for a MS reading included in the main text of Grabe's edition of Alexandrinus) and by the Roman numeral III (for a MS reading not incorporated into Grabe's text). Tischendorf used the symbol "Ax" in his critical apparatus.

3. Symbol in HP: XII. In the collation of Field this MS is known both as "Cod. XII" and "Cod. Jes", the latter name coming from Montfaucon's designation of it as "Ms. Jes[uitarum]".

4. The alternative and more common symbol for this MS has been the Heb letter \aleph , but printing and typing expediency favours the use of the letter S.

5. Symbol in HP: 23.

6. Those oracles with different page number for the Philistine and Edom oracles follow the Heb arrangement of the text. An exception is MS 106 which has a special order (see below p.105).

7. In Field's collation this MS is designated 87*.

8. In Field's collation this MS is designated 87. MS 88 in Field has reference to a collation by Bernardo Stephanopoli of a not very accurate copy of the original codex executed by Leo Allatius (d. 1669).

9. This MS is one of the few which contains the entire Bible; in BM referred to by the letter "p".

9^a. Designated 144 in HP and Nestle-Dahse.

10. This papyrus, containing fragmentary verses from Chs. 28-32, is one of five papyri unavailable to Ziegler at the time of his publication (in addition to 986, these are 804, 817, 837, and 984). However, the yield from Jer 29 is not great: only the two end letters -υ, from the definite article τοῦ, in 29:11

11. Three remote Latin allusions to the text of Jer's Philistine and Edom oracle on file at the Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristique at Strasbourg are the following:

1) Origen, in his commentary on Matthew, (GCS, Origenes XI, p. 7) is thought indirectly to hint at 29(47):4 in the following remark: ". . . quomodo et visio Tyri vel quaecumque prophetae de Tyro vel de principe Tyri, quomodo etiam visio quadrupedum in deserto apud Esaiam pendent in duobus istis mandatis".

2) Pseudo-Cyprian in Adversus Iudaeos (CCL 4, p. 273; also in the edition of D. van Damme, Freiburg, 1969, p. 127) may have 29:19(49:18) in mind in the phrase "et ad solitudinem Sodomae patriam eorum redegit".

3) Victorinus Poetovionensis in In Apocalypsim (CSEL 49, p. 52) may allude to 29:23(49:22) // MT 48:40 in the phrase "et quod morte devicta ascenderit in caelis extendens alas suas".

However, these allusions are so uncertain and secondary that they can be dispensed with in the collation.

12. Walton made no attempt to harmonize the Gk and Heb texts in parallel columns, so that LXX Jer 29 is found opposite MT Jer 29!

13. The term preferred by Ernest C. Colwell ("Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings", pp. 96-97). For Colwell a "variation unit" is defined as a certain length of text "wherein our manuscripts present at least two variant forms; it is that passage in which differences occur". By this concept Colwell wishes to avoid the misleading impression that can be created by the setting up of one text as the norm against which "variants" are plotted (see also the article by E.J. Epp, "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant'" in the George D. Kilpatrick FS, especially pp. 156-157). We may accept Colwell's point and caution, but the fact remains that the only practical way to proceed is to use one particular text against which to plot other readings. It only needs to be emphasized again that this collation text is entirely neutral and that no value judgement on the "variants" to that text is intended at this stage.

14. Even earlier, groupings of MSS had already been noticed by Holmes and Parson in the process of their collations (cf. the comments in the preface to Vol. 1 on the peculiar text represented by MSS 19, 108, 118, in the Pentateuch).

15. Account must be taken of the change of textual pattern within some MSS; e.g. 130 is under influence of the L group in Chs. 1-9, similarly 538 in Chs. 17-20, 37-38, 48-49 (cf. Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 83).

16. By the term "recension" in this discussion is to be understood a text that has been subjected to, consistent and deliberate revision, as opposed to one that has been formed by accidental or ad hoc scribal change.

17. Previous scholars (e.g. Thackeray, Grammar, p. 4; Soisalon-Soininen, Der Charakter der asterisierten Zuzätze in der Septuaginta, p. 1; D.W. Gooding, Recensions of the LXX Pentateuch, p. 5) have pointed to the Origenic recension as the place to start in the work of LXX text restoration, and my research confirms the methodological validity of this approach.

18. Gk text in GCS, Origenes X, p. 388. English translation taken mainly from M.F. Wiles, "Origen as a Biblical Scholar", CHB I, p. 457.

19. Other references by Origen to his use of the critical signs can be found in the following places: Epistula ad Africanus, PG 11, cols. 56-60; Johannescommentar, GCS, Origenes IV, p. 410; Die Schrift vom Gebet, GCS, Origenes II, p. 332.

The traditional view that Origen took over the Ἀριστάρχεια σήματα from the Alexandrian grammarians in his work on the Hexapla is well presented by Swete, Introduction, pp. 69ff. In more recent times the question has been raised by P. Kahle whether these signs were ever present in the Hexapla at all ("The Greek Bible Manuscripts Used by Origen", JBL 79 (1960), 116). It is true that nowhere does Origen explicitly state that he employed these signs in the Hexapla itself. As Jellicoe has pointed out (SMS, p. 124), this is only an inference we make and as such may be quite erroneous. For our present purposes, however, the question is purely academic. The vital point is that Origen on his own testimony--and this can hardly be controverted--did use these signs somewhere. Jellicoe suggests in response to Kahle's challenge that Origen some time after the completion of the Hexapla may have composed a separate recension of the LXX with the signs included, but this is pure speculation and has no more merit in it than the traditional view. Apart from the evidence of Mercati's Hexaplaric fragment of the Psalms (which may be open to other explanations, cf. Bo Johnson, Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta, pp. 14-15), it still seems in order to speak of the fifth column text of the Hexapla as containing the LXX recension of Origen replete with the critical signs.

20. It goes without saying that not every asterised reading in our MSS is uncritically to be attributed to Origen. The question of the reliability of the signs is a problem that must be dealt with case by case. This will be demonstrated in the analysis below.

21. Critical signs are occasionally found in other MSS besides those mentioned here, e.g. at 29:4 in MSS 449-770 (see below, p. 64).

22. Other forms of the obelus attested elsewhere are — — — — —

(cf. Field, I, lv-lvi). The sign ω is of infrequent occurrence and is unique to Syh. Field devoted a special section to it (I, lxiv-lxvii) and concluded that it is merely a different form of the obelus. Ziegler agrees with this in regard to its use in Jer (Ieremias, pp. 78-79), but in Is (Isaias, p. 59, n. 1) and in Ez (Ezechiel pp. 42-43) he thinks it is used rather as a kind of index to point out a reading present in Syh but absent in 88.

23. See below p. 66 n. 26 for a discussion of the reliability of Hexaplaric signs on double readings.

24. Compare the comment by Margolis, "The principle of expressing the Hebrew nota accusativi was present to the mind of Origen when he started his work of revision; where he failed to live up to it in the earlier edition he made up for the omission in the subsequent recension" (Margolis is speaking of the Hexapla and Tetrapla editions respectively), "The Textual Criticism of the Greek Old Testament", Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 67 (1928), 194.

25. This view was defended by Wevers in his article, "A Study in the Textual History of Codex Vaticanus in the Books of Kings," ZAW 64 (1952), 189. S.P. Brock came to a negative conclusion on this subject in his study of the recensions of the Gk Samuel, 1966, p. 55.

26. The same pattern of new reading asterised, old reading no sign may be observed in 88-Syh on eleven occasions elsewhere in Jer (3:19 5:5 6:12 31:30 31:31 34:7 36:2 38:8,12 39:8 51:28). On eight occasions in 88-Syh both elements of a double reading are marked (new reading asterised, old reading obelised: 2:6 4:20 6:2 31:36 37:6 38:13,14 45:9). Six times in 88-Syh neither part of a double reading has preserved a sign (29:14 33:17 38:12 48:9 49:1 51:23, cf. Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 79). These statistics point to the inconsistency with which Origen's critical signs have been preserved even in our primary Hexaplaric witnesses. For confirmation of this compare the article by C.T. Fritsch, "The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs", JBL 72 (1953), 169-181.

27. An alternative explanation might be that ἰπιπιήσεται was intended to translate אָבַד (cf. the translation περισφύσουσιν for אָבַד in Is 40:31), but this seems less likely. According to 86^{mg} and Syh^{mg}, both Aquila and Symmachus substituted ἀναβήσεται for ἰπιπιήσεται (ἀναβαίνει is the standard translation of אָבַד both in Aquila and in the LXX), while the reading κὼι ἰπιπιήσεται of Symmachus in 86^{mg} is definitely sub asterisco indicating an addition; also the presence of the conjunction with ἰπιπιήσεται suggests that this verb corresponds to the Heb אָבַד rather than אָבַד .

28. Where it is assumed, but cannot be proved because of the nature of the Syriac language, that Syh attests the same reading as 88, this is indicated by the annotation 88(-Syh).

29. Ziegler thinks that the Q^{mg} reading which assigns the addition of $\lambda\lambda\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to $\alpha'\theta'$ is the correct one rather than the \omicron' symbol in 86^{mg} (see his second apparatus).

30. Jerome's words are: "vix enim unus aut alter inveniatur liber, qui ista [i.e. additamenta hexaplaris] non habeat" (CSEL 55, p. 389).

31. For example, Ziegler has determined that 233 is a MS heavily influenced by the Hexaplaric recension and wherever possible associates it with the O group. There is no evidence in Jer 29 which would of itself lead to this conclusion and the matter can be decided only on the basis of a study of the entire book. In fact, it will be argued below (pp. 118-19) that 233 is not Hexaplaric in the OAN section.

32. This is the same methodology as that employed by S.P. Brock in his unpublished Oxford dissertation, The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel, cf. p. ix.

33. It should be noted that this symbol differs from the italicized L employed by Ziegler; in the latter's text the joint attestation of the sub-groups L + l is marked L'. In the critique of Ziegler's text (Ch. 3) when citing directly from his apparatus I sometimes employ his italicized symbols (cf. pp. 118 ff.); otherwise I normally use the unitalicized forms which entail no commitment to Ziegler's sub-groups.

34. An unintentional scribal change from π to σ is theoretically also possible.

35. $\omega' = \iota\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma$ a new translator whose readings are attested approximately 100 times in Jer (cf. Ziegler, Ieremias, pp. 102, 106). In Jer 29 we have additional examples of his translation in vv. 3(2x), 4, 9, 20.

36. In the majority text the phrase reads $\omicron\tau\iota\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\iota}\omega$. In the hypothetically faulty uncial, the middle arm of the ϵ may have been missing and hence the letter would have been read as a sigma (ς). To make sense of the resultant text, $\omicron\tau\iota\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\iota}\omega$ the first part was read as $\omicron\tau\iota\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon\varsigma$, followed by full stop. The κ was then taken for the conjunction $\kappa\alpha\iota$, and the latter part read $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \Delta\iota\omega\acute{\iota}\omega$ (cf. the remark by Ziegler, Ieremias, p. 81 that several erroneous readings show that L goes back to an uncial "codex archetypus").

37. The incidence of readings in this section would probably have been higher still had the whole of the chapter been quoted by Chr/Tht. For it should be understood that when Chr/Tht fail to support a reading from O/L or simply L this is more often due to the fact that the reading in question is not attested by Chr/Tht than to the fact that they have a different reading.

38. There are a total of six double readings in the L recension of Jer 29. Here they are all brought together:

- 29:6 ἕως τίνος κόψεις / ἕως πότε συστραφήσεσθε
 29:10 σοι / οἱ
 29:11 (τὸ) σπέρμα αὐτοῦ / διὰ χεῖρα
 29:12 ἵνα σωθῶσιν / καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτοὺς διασώσω
 29:14 βοσὸρ / ἐν μέσῳ μέρους
 29:20 καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστήσατε / καὶ
 τῖς ἐκλεκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐπισκέψομαι

39. The omission in v. 8 of ἔχειτο σοφία αὐτῶν L-51 407 449¹ was undoubtedly caused by scribal parablepsis: συνετῶν ἔχειτο σοφία αὐτῶν.

40. "Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat," Praefatio Hieronymi in librum Paralipomenon, PL 28, col. 1392.

41. See the works of Ceriani ("Le recensioni dei LXX e la versione latina detta Itala", p. 1 R. Istituto Lombardo, 1866), Field (Origenes Hexaplorum quae supersunt . . . fragmenta, I, 1875, pp. lxxxiv-xciv; II, pp. 428-429), Lagarde (Ankündigung, p. 22; Pars Prior, pp. xiii-xv; Mittheilungen, I, 175), Rahlfs (Septuaginta-Studien III) and Moore ("The Antiochian Recension of the Septuagint", The American Journal of Semitic Languages 29 (1912-13), 37).

42. See "La prétendue 'recension lucianique'" in Les Devanciers d'Aquila, 1963, pp. 126-127, and especially his "Post-Scriptum: la 'recension lucianique'", appendix to the article "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11,2 - 1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des 'Devanciers d'Aquila'", in 1972 Proceedings (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2), ed. R.A. Kraft, 1972, pp. 64-89.

Quite arbitrarily Barthélemy proposes that the term "recension" must be reserved for a text that gives evidence of deliberate approximation towards the Heb ("Post-Scriptum", pp. 72-74). But why the Heb must be a criterion for the definition of a recension is a mystery. It seems better to continue using the term with reference to a text that has undergone conscious revision according to certain discernible guidelines. Under this definition the L group of Jer certainly qualifies as a "recension".

43. The situation which obtains in Jer is therefore quite different from the text commonly labeled Lucianic in Samuel where already Wellhausen showed that it contained many ancient readings lost elsewhere in the Gk Tradition.

44. According to Rahlfs' Verzeichniss there exist another four Jer Catena MSS: 97, 430, 435, 567(fragmentary), and 568. For Ziegler's assertion that MSS 349, 533, and 573 are also Catena MSS containing the book of Jer see p. 15 n. 1 above;

for Ziegler's contention that MS 68 is dependent on the Catena text see below, p.109 n. 54 .

45. Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften, Freiburg, 1889, p. 2, n. 2.

46. C readings have not been documented in these lists.

47. The discovery of pre-Hexaplaric revisions or recensions is no new thing; cf. earlier the discussion by D.W. Gooding, "The Argument for a Pre-Origenic Recension", pp. 88-89 of his Cambridge thesis The Greek Deuteronomy (1954) and the articles by G. Zuntz and P. Katz in ZAW 68 (1956), 124-184, and ZAW 69 (1957), 77-84, respectively. Most recently one thinks of the Kaige recension discovered by Barthélemy.

My conclusions on the character of the Q text--which were reached quite independently--correspond to those of Ziegler (Ieremias, p. 63) and thus tend to confirm the soundness of his interpretation (contra R. Tournay, RB 65 (1958), 292, in a review of Ziegler's Jeremiah text).

48. Compare the very similar textual phenomena in the recensions of 1 Sam where readings attested within the limits of O/D + L/E are likely to be Hexaplaric, whereas those with wider support or those without the support of O/D are less likely so (Brock, Recensions, pp. 127ff.).

49. "Le recensioni dei LXX de^{1a} versione latina detta Itala," 1886, p. 106; De codice Marchaliano seu Vaticano graeco 2125 Prophetarum, 1890, pp. 48ff., 105ff.

50. R.R. Ottley, Isaiah According to the Septuagint, I, 1904, pp. 6ff., 14ff.; II, 1906, pp. xff., xxxiff; Handbook to the Septuagint, pp. 91ff. W.O.E. Oesterley, Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Book of Amos, 1902, p. 2 ("That Q contains the Hesychian text is universally admitted"); F.C. Burkitt, EB, IV, 1903, col. 5021 ("the Hesychian text is best represented by the first hand of Codex Marchalianus"); W. Grossouw, The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets, 1938, p. 16; A. Vaccari, "The Hesychian Recension of the Septuagint," Biblica 46 (1965), 60-66; Gehman, JBL 48 (1929) 329-332, and HSDB, 1963, p. 351; J.W. Wevers, IDB, IV, 1962, p. 275.

51. Rahlfs was sceptical of being able to trace the Hesychian text, cf. Septuaginta, I, p. xxxi, though earlier, Septuaginta Studien, II, 1907, pp. 183-197, he had identified the Hesychian recension with the Lower Egyptian text in Psalms. Ziegler has been negative throughout, cf. Isaias, p. 23, Ezechiel, p. 29, n. 3, Daniel, p. 47, n. 1. Others have tried to identify it with the B text, e.g., Grabe, Letter to Mill, 1705; recently re-argued by Jellicoe, JBL 88 (1963), 409-418.

52. Ceriani, De codice Marchaliano, pp. 34-35; Swete, Introduction, p. 144.

53. The above are more significant A readings; there are of course other unique A readings which are merely clerical and orthographic.

54. Another pair of minuscules that belong to this group are 68 and 122, but these are near identical copies of B, at least in Jer. Ziegler describes 68 as a Catena text (Ieremias, p. 11), but this is definitely not so in Jer. Some examples from Jer 29 that prove the dependence of 68 and 122 on B are the following:

- 29:3 ἐφ' B S 68 122 130] ἐπὶ rel.
- 29:4 ἐπερχομένη B 68 122] ἐρχομένη rel.
- 29:9 δαίδαμ B 68 122] δεδαν 401 538 544; δεδανω 534;
δαίδαν rel.
- 29:10 ὥς B S 68 122] ὡς περ A-106-410 C-613;
ὡς εἰ rel.
- 29:11 οἱ καὶ B S 68 122 130
- 29:13 εἶπεν B S 68 122 538] λέγει rel.
- 29:21 αὐτήν B S* 68 122 106 410 130 538] αὐτή A; αὐτῆς S* 66;
αὐτοῦ rel.
- 29:22 ἐφοβήθη B S 68 122 538] ἐσ(ε)ίσθη rel.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Some examples of the decidedly secondary readings which it attests for Jer 29 are the following (underlined):

29:1 καὶ ἐγένετο ῥῆμα κυρίου πρὸς ἱερεμίαν τὸν προφήτην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους πρὸ τοῦ πατάξαι φαραῶ τὴν γῆν = MT

29:4 τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους τοὺς καταλοίπους τῶν νήσων τῆς καππαδοκίας = MT

29:13 ἰδοὺ οἷς = MT; οὐ μὴ ἀθώωθήσῃ, ὅτι πιῶν πίεσαι = MT

29:16 ἰδοὺ μικρόν = MT

29:18 ἐκστήσεται καὶ συριεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν πληγὴν αὐτῆς = MT

29:19 om. παντοκράτωρ = MT

29:22 om. ὅτι = MT; om. καὶ = MT

2. A comparative chart of selected readings from Jer 29 illustrates the kind of trivial modifications found in various editions of the LXX textus receptus:

<u>B^x</u>	<u>Sintine</u>	<u>Mains</u>	<u>Bagster</u>	<u>van Ess/Tisch.</u>	<u>Suete</u>
29:4 ἐξολιθρεύσει (ἐξολο. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	*
29:5 ἀπερίφη (ἀπερρ. B ^c)	c	*	c	c	*
Ἐνακείμ	-κιμ	*	-κιμ	-κιμ	*
29:6 οὐκ (οὐχ B ^c)	c	c	c	c	c
29:10 καταλίψουσιν (καταλείψ. B ^c)	c	c	-λειψουσι	c	c
κατάλιμμα (καταλει. B ^c)	c	c	c	c	*
ἐπιθήσουσιν	-σι	*	-σι	-σι	*

<u>29:12</u> ὑπολίπεται (ὑπολείπ. B ^c)	ε	ε	ε	ε	*
ζήσεται (ζηση. B ^c)	ε	ε	ε	ε	*
χῆραι	pr. αἱ	*	pr. αἱ	pr. αἱ	*
<u>29:13</u> ἀθωμένη (ἀθωω. B ^c)	ε	ε	ε	ε	ε
<u>29:17</u> νοσσειάν (νοσσι. B ^c)	ε	ε	ε	ε	ε
<u>29:19</u> καθίστη	-σει	*	-σει	-σει	*
ἐνοικήσει	κατοί.	*	κατοί.	κατοί.	*
<u>29:20</u> στησται (στήσε. B ^c)	ε	ε	ε	ε	ε
<u>29:21</u> συψηθωσιν (συμψηθωσι B ^c)	ε ε	ε *	συμψηθωσι	ε ε	* *
αὐτήν	αὐτούς	*	αὐτούς	αὐτούς	*
<u>29:23</u> ἐκτείνει (εκτεν. B ^c)	ε	ε	ε	ε	*

3. Cf. above, p. 6 . He was, of course, aided by a great deal of scholarship that had already been expended on the LXX of Jer (cf. his remark, "Die notierte Literatur zeigt, dass bereits in ausgiebiger Weise die LXX von Ier. Thr. Bar. untersucht worden ist" Beiträge, p. 6).

4. Note that Lagarde listed the witnesses in this order, "Noch einmal", pp. 230-231.

5. The sub-divisions in some of the other editions one feels

become too complicated to be helpful, e.g. Isaias L^{'''} = 1I + 1II + 1III, and C^{'''} = C + cI + cII.

6. See his comments in Duodecim Prophetae, pp. 138-139; however, in Isaias the insert sheet "Erklärung der Zeichen und Abkürzungen" contains an extensive list of "codices mixti".

7. Cf. above the discussion on the sub-divisions in L, pp. 87-9

8. For example, why in 29:15 are V-239-538 joined by hyphens for the reading $\tau\alpha \text{ } \epsilon\theta\nu\eta$, but 106 239 538 are not joined by hyphens for the variant $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$? Why in 1:19 for the variant $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ is 410 included with the Q group rather than with the B group?

9. Question: Why does Ziegler employ a period with abbreviations for the Church Fathers but not for the daughter versions?

10. These extraordinary omissions are as follows:

In Is

15:1	106 538 ^{txt}	109 91 ^{txt} -490 ^{txt}
17:1	106 538 ^{txt}	
19:1	106 538 ^{txt}	407 763 ^{txt}
21:1	106 538 ^{txt}	301
21:11	106 538 ^{txt}	393
22:1	106 538 ^{txt}	763 ^{txt}
23:1	106 538 ^{txt}	763 ^{txt} 407 ^{txt} 456

In Jer

26(46):13	106 538 ^{txt}	
27(50):1	106 538 ^{txt}	
29(47):1	106 538 ^{txt}	Bo Arm ^p
29:8(49:7)	46 106 538 ^{txt}	
30(49):1	46 106 538 ^{txt}	Arm ^p
30:6(49:28)	106 538 ^{txt}	
30:12(49:23)	106 538 ^{txt}	763 ^{txt} Arm ^p

11. For example, for the reading $\dot{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon \mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$ at 29:16 Ziegler cites all the supporting and non-supporting evidence; why he made an exception in this case is not entirely clear.

12. Ziegler's comment to the effect that this calculation "ist nicht allzu schwierig" (Ieremias, p. 138) is not entirely fair. For somebody well familiar with the MS evidence for a particular book such calculations may not be too demanding, but for the occasional reader or scholar who quickly needs to know the supporting evidence for a particular reading the process is not at all so simple.

13. Cf. the entry at 1:19: $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ Cyr Tht] $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon(\nu)$
 B-S-239-538 V+ O-233 C. The mention of Cyril and Theodoret with
 the lemma text does not mean that they only attest the $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$
 reading; rather it means that $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ is found in all Gk
 MSS not mentioned for $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon(\nu)$, plus the Fathers Cyril and
 Theodoret.

14. Hence S.P. Brock's remark in the SOTS Book List, 1978,
 p. 46, to the effect that the new edition "is evidently a straight
 reprint of the 1957 edition...without any alterations" re-
 mains generally true with the exception of the apparatus to Jer 29.

15. See for example the work being done on the Armenian
 version: M.E. Stone, "The Old Armenian Version of Isaiah: Towards
 the Choice of the Base Text for an Edition", Textus 8 (1973),
 107-123.

16. Cf. the critique of Wever's edition of Genesis by K.G.
 O'Connel in CBQ 39 (1977), 119 ff.

17. Some anonymous marginal readings are known to come
 from the Hexaplaric recension while others come from the Lucianic
 recension (see above, p. 36). It must be a difficult, if not
 impossible, task on every occasion to correctly associate these
 readings with the right group. Ziegler more often than not
 links an anonymous marginal reading with the Hexaplaric recension.

18. See Ziegler's explanation for this procedure, Isaias,
 p. 113.

19. The term "contemporary" approach is mine rather than
 Walters'. Walters employed no parallel term to the adjectives
 "traditional" and "documentary" used to describe the first two
 alternatives.

20. A couple of minor differences may however be noted.
 In the case of the movable nu Ziegler follows the "school rule"
 (cf. his comment Duodecim Prophetas, p. 118) whereas Rahlfs
 inserts it regardless of what letter follows. In the Edom oracle
 compare the following spellings:

	<u>Rahlfs</u>	<u>Ziegler</u>
30:3	$\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$	29:10 $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$
30:6	$\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$	29:13 $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon$
30:8	$\alpha\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$	29:15 $\alpha\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon$
30:	$\epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$	29:1 $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon$
30:12	$\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$	29:19 $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon$
30:14	$\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\eta\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$	29:21 $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\eta\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\iota$

By contrast Ziegler appears always to employ the final
sigma for $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$, where Rahlfs occasionally omits it, cf.
 13:9, 35:6.

21. See the comment by G.D. Kilpatrick in his review of R. Hanhart's Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches (1960): "It is quite clear from these pages (i.e. Ch. 1) how much students of the Greek Bible owe to Dr. P. Katz, but we have to distinguish between what our authors wrote and what is philologically correct," GGA 215 (1963), 12. See also a comment to the same effect by T. Muraoka in his review of Walters' Text, JSS 19 (1974), 307.

22. Ziegler himself says that in the matter of proper names he has subjected Rahlfs and Katz to a new appraisal, the result of which is embodied in Ch. 2 of Beiträge, "Transkriptionen".

23. The comment is not necessarily meant as a criticism but merely as reporting on Ziegler's methodology.

24. W. Kappler, "Ziele und Aufgaben des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens", GGA 202 (1940), 115-124.

25. Cf. above, p.5n.8

26. The most common Heb equivalence is as might be expected שֶׁרִיחַ (Gen 45:7 2 Ki 14:7 4 Ki 19:31 Is 14:30 Jer 27(50):26 Jer 27(40):11) or שֶׁרִיחַ (Is 10:22 14:22), but it is also used to translate שֶׁרִיחַ in Jud 5:13 4 Re 10:11, שֶׁרִיחַ in 3 Re 15:4, שֶׁרִיחַ in Job 22:20, and possibly שֶׁרִיחַ in Is 37:30.

27. The interpretation of the phrase is complicated by the uncertainty regarding the reading δὲ χεῖρα at the commencement of the verse which Ziegler emends to ἐπιχειρα, but on the basis of the MS reading the sentence ὁ δὲ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ καὶ γείτονός μου might be translated, "they have perished each by the hand of his brother and his neighbour", which seems preferable to ὁ δὲ χεῖρα ἀδελφοῦ καὶ γείτονός μου, "they have perished each by the hand of his brother, my neighbour", where the deity seems to speak of Israel as "my neighbour".

28. The same thing can be seen happening in Ziegler's decision in the form of the "concluding formula" λέγει / εἶπε / φησὶ κς. In 1:19 and 2:3 Ziegler opts for the form λέγει, κύριος, on the basis of translation pattern (see below, p.197 n.32) against that of the main MS evidence (cf. his explanation Beiträge, p. 38).

29. In NT textual criticism there is a lively on-going debate concerning the validity of the eclectic method and how far it is to be carried; see for instance the Festschrift for Prof. G. Kilpatrick Studies in New Testament Language and Text (1976) which includes essays both pro and contra Kilpatrick's own position. Three useful survey articles on the present state of the debate are those by J.E. Epp in JBL 93 (1974), 386-414, FTR 69 (1976), 211-257, and D. Parker, NTS 24 (1977), 149-162. A real desideratum for LXX textual criticism is a careful analysis and evaluation of the craft of textual criticism as it has been practiced and is being practiced today in the Gk OT. For a sampling of Kilpatrick's method applied to the LXX see his review of W. Kappler and R. Hanhart's editions of 1, 2, and 3 Maccabees in GGA 215 (1963), 10-22.

30. "Diese Ausführungen zeigen, dass eine v o l l e Gewähr für die Ursprünglichkeit verschiedener Lesarten nicht immer geboten werden kann....Die fortschreitende Forschung mag manche Lesarten, die im App. stehen, in den Text aufnehmen und umgekehrt", Duodecim Prophetae, p. 133.

31. See the statistics given by B. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, pp. 184-5.

32. Cf. K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament, pp. 9-10. For a review of the arguments advanced against the practice of emendation in the NT in a paper advocating a return to this practice, see the lively article, written with wit reminiscent of A. E. Houseman, by John Strugnell, "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament", CBQ 36 (1974), 543-58.

33. The lexicons distinguish between רִבְנָה and רִבְנָה , the former found only in the construct form רִבְנָה with בְּנֵי (5x) or לְנֵי (1x) referring to the deity, the latter in all other contexts. For the purpose of this review, no such distinction is necessary.

34. The same tendency simply to employ the root meaning of רִבְנָה is characteristic of the Min Gk VSS. Thus Aquila, where attested, almost uniformly uses $\deltaυνάστης$ (Is 34:7, 46:12, Ps 21(22):13, 49(50):13, 77(78):25, 131(132):2, or $\deltaυνάτος$ (Is 10:33), except 1 Sam 21:7(8) זֶרַח (MS 57 sub σ') and Lam 1:15 ὑπερμεγέθη (probably reading רִבְנָה). The other versions were more free but still stayed close to the base meaning, e.g., Symmachus has $\deltaυνάστης$ (Is 49:26), $\deltaυνάτος$ (Is 10:33), $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Is 34:7), $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ - (Is 46:12), $\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$? (Ps 21(22):13, Field citing Montfaucon), $\pi\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ (Ps 67(68):31), ὑπερήφανος (Ps 75(76):6), $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (Ps 77(78):25), $\mu\epsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ (Lam 1:15); Theodotion has $\deltaυνάστης$ (Ps 77(78):25), $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Is 34:7), and $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Is 10:33).

Among the Eng VSS the RV tends in the same direction, cf., Jud 5:22 "strong ones," and similarly Jer 8:16, 26(46):15.

35. The equivalence $\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / רִבְנָה (not always a correct equivalence) was facilitated in each instance by the association of רִבְנָה with some other animal, e.g., in Jer 27(50):11 $\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ / רִבְנָה is parallel to $\beta\omicron\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ / גִּלְגָּל . The Eng VSS agree that the correct translation there is "strong horses" (RV) or "stallions" (RSV, NEB, JB). The LXX (mis)translation $\beta\omicron\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ has determined the further mistranslation of לִהְיוֹת by $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\iota\acute{\zeta}\omega$; לִהְיוֹת / לִהְיוֹת is otherwise correctly and uniformly rendered in Jer by $\chi\rho\epsilon\mu\iota\tau\iota\acute{\zeta}\omega$ / $\chi\rho\epsilon\mu\iota\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (cf., 5:8 8:16, 13:27, 38(31):7). The important point to note, however, is that the meaning $\beta\omicron\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ was derived from the immediate context.

36. The majority of MSS have the reading ἰππασίας "ἵππων" but this is undoubtedly a double reading, as recognized by Giesebrecht (p. 231), Kühler (p. 16) Streane (p. 111), Rudolph (ZAW,

p. 279), and Ziegler (Beiträge, p. 99). That ἵππασίας and not ἵππων was the original reading is made virtually certain by the following considerations: it is inexplicable why the reading ἵππασίας should have been added to ἵππων since the addition would make a clear reading more difficult and would not correspond to the Heb; on the other hand, it is easy to see that ἵππων could have been added later to give sense to the Gk, cf., the omission of ἵππων in V-46-86-198-239-544 0-233 verss.^p Possibly ἵππων was at one time a marginal gloss on ἵππασίας which was later incorporated into the text. Origen probably found only ἵππασίας in his Vorlage, otherwise he would also have included ἵππων, placing one of the words under obelus. Ziegler correctly prints only ἵππασίας in the text.

37. All the MSS read ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός, but again it is possible that we have here another double reading (so Giesebrecht, p. 231, Kühler, p. 21, and Streane, p. 263). Ziegler is also convinced that the pair form a double reading but is less certain which of the two words was original and which was added later. In his discussion of this lectio duplex (Beiträge, p. 96) he seems to prefer ἐκλεκτός as the original, though he admits that μόσχος could also be considered such, in which case ἐκλεκτός is later approximation to the Heb. In the text he shows his ambivalence by printing both words but placing ὁ ἐκλεκτός in square brackets. Whether μόσχος or ἐκλεκτός, or even ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός was the original Gk, it is clear that the translation was derived from the context as a parallel to the Egyptian bull-god Apis (a translation based in turn on the reading אַפִּי־סָפַר "Apis has fled" vs. MT אַפִּי־סָפַר "swept away").

38. These could represent different Vorlagen (for 1 Sam 21:8 cf. Lagarde's suggestion that LXX testifies to a reading אִפְי־סָפַר but see the remark by S.R. Driver, Notes, p. 176; for Ps 75(76):6 BHS propose אִפְי־סָפַר; for Is 46:12 BHS suggest אִפְי־סָפַר), or they may be desperate attempts by the translators to make sense of the Heb that for one reason or another was difficult to the translator (cf. for instance the various translations of אִפְי־סָפַר in the Eng VSS of Is 46:12). The Heb and Gk of Job is notoriously difficult to correlate and in the case of אִפְי־סָפַר we cannot even be sure that this was intended as a translation of אִפְי־סָפַר (cf. the question marks in HR).

39. Text of the NT, p. 185, n. 1.

40. Ibid, p. 183.

41. According to the researches of H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat (Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus, London, 1938, pp. 54-55), the book of Jer (along with Is, Lam, MP, ShepHer) was copied by Scribe B. The careless habits of this copyist they find hard to describe in moderate language and are amazed he could have been chosen for such an important job. They write, "He [Scribe B] seems to have had no firm visual impression of Greek, so barbarous and grotesque are the forms which his

misspellings can present to the eye, and with such utter inconsistency does he sway from correct to incorrect. . . . Pure blunders, like telescoping of words and omission of letters or syllables, are incredibly common . . . ; more curious is the wrong insertion of the consonant in the middle of the word, as in $\pi(\rho)\sigma\iota\eta\sigma\eta$ (Jer 37:24), $\delta\sigma\rho(\mu)\alpha\tau\alpha$ (Jer 26:4), $\sigma\alpha(\nu)\rho\kappa\alpha\nu$ (Jer 51:35). Another frequent error is produced by metathesis, $\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ for $\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ (Is 35:6), $\delta\iota\omega\mu\iota\epsilon\nu$ for $\delta\iota\omega\mu\iota\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota$ (Jer 3:5). . . ." In the light of this testimony it is not difficult to see how the $\sigma\tau$ of $\acute{\sigma}\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$ could have been inverted by metathesis to $\tau\omicron$, or how a ρ might suddenly have appeared between π and σ of $\pi\omicron\varsigma$ to yield $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (cf. $\pi(\rho)\sigma\iota\eta\sigma\eta$ Jer 37:24).

42. If $\tau\acute{o}\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ corresponds to וְכָל this presumably means that the translator read וְכָל as a collective for וְכָלִי .

43. According to Ziegler (Beiträge, p. 68), Grabe proposed $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\rho\upsilon\gamma\eta\ \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$. But this is not correct. The statement in the "Prolegomena" clearly reads, "pro $\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa$ in Rom. Cod. legendum sit $\epsilon\nu\ \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi$, juxta Heb. $\eta\ \iota\theta\ \text{ד'ג}$."

44. This translation is found in Ex 10:19 13:18 15:4,22 23:31; Num 14:25 21:4 33:10,11; Dt 1:40 2:1 11:4; Josh 2:10 4:23 24:6; Jud 11:16(A text); Ps 105(106):7,9,22 135(136):13, 15; Neh 9:9. In 3 Re 9:26 is found $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \iota\sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$.

45. According to Streane, the addition of the negative is found in 2:3(2x) 5:2 9:5(4) 23:32 28(51):58 29:22 (49:21) 38:35 (31:37). The omission is found in 2:25, 4:1 5:3,10 18:18 28(51):3 43(36):25. Streane also refers to Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, p. 26, for evidence of the same phenomenon happening in 1 and 2 Reg. Along the same lines compare the recent article by M.L. Klein, "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique", Biblica 57 (1976), 515-537, especially pp. 516-529, "Addition or Deletion of the Negative Particle".

46. Cf. the device employed in the current Peshitta project, The Old Testament in Syriac, General Preface, 1972, p. VIII.

47. Compare J. Barr's review of Walters' The Text of the Septuagint, particularly his comment, "Walters seems to have belonged to an age which accepted the emendation of the text more readily than the present generation of scholars does", HJ 26 (1975), 61-63.

48. For some examples of conjectured readings that have been vindicated by papyri discoveries in Ezekiel, see Ziegler, Beiträge, p. 17.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Thackeray actually delineated three translation units in the book, the third being the "Historical Appendix", Ch. 52, which he designated "Jeremiah y"; however, he adduced only scant support for the third translator and seemed less sure of his case in this matter (cf. "Gr. Tr. Jer.", pp. 246, 260).

2. Ziegler's treatment of the multiple translator problem in Jer is in fact ambiguous and unsatisfactory. Several times he distinguishes between "Ier. 1" and "Ier. II" and refers to them as "der erste Ier.-Übersetzer" (Beiträge, p. 127) and "der zweite Ier.-Übers." (Beiträge, p. 49); this distinction then becomes the basis for text-critical decisions, e.g., in the preference for the form $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ at 1:19 and 2:3 where the majority of MSS have $\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\varphi\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ respectively (cf. Beiträge, p. 38; Ieremias, p. 44). On other occasions he simply speaks of "der Übersetzer" apparently with reference to the whole book and makes decisions on the basis of the unity of the translation, e.g. his preference for the word $\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\eta}\mu\omicron\tau\alpha$ at 29:10 (Jer b') versus the majority text readings $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\mu\alpha$ (-ωα) on the precedent of the translation $\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ for לִבְיֹט at 6:9 (Jer a') Beiträge, p. 48).

3. For elaboration of this part of Tov's argument see pp. 6, 42, 135 of his book, and particularly the appendix, "Why is Jer-R's Revision Preserved Only in Jer b'?", pp. 162-165.

4. Cf. LSJ. Usually the context is one of joy, exultation or victory rather than one of pain or grief, but the latter sense certainly is attested, including the NT usage at Mk 5:38.

5. Rahlfs. Jer a': 1:18 5:19 16:10 18:23 19:15 23:8.

Jer b': 29:2 33:2,2 36:1 39:23 43:11,16,32 47:5
48:12 51:1.

Elsewhere: Gen 19:4 Lev 6:22 Deut 22:19,29 Josh 6:12,
13,19 2 Re 3:25 3 Re 2:26 12:24 13:11 1 Chr 10:11 16:47
17:10 Esth 8:13 9:28 Ps 21:23 Prov 25:4 Am 7:10 Zech 7:5
Ez 38:8 Dan(Th.) 4:8.

6. Ziegler. Jer a': 18:23 19:15 23:8; Jer b': 29:2
33:2,2 39:23 48:12 51:1.

7. Tov believes that the readings $\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\upsilon}\psi\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ (from נֶחֱמָה or נִחְמָה versus MT נִחְמָה) in 6:2 and $\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in 29(47):6 (from נִחְמָה versus MT נִחְמָה) are additional examples of the same deliberate attempt to avoid the roots נִחְמָה / נִחְמָה .

8. Not 29(49):7 as in Tov, p. 31.

9. The totals include all occurrences of the translated name in question whether or not a corresponding נִחְמָה

is found in the MT. My totals do not always coincide with those of Tov. For instance, in the case of σάβωθ his total of 58 for Is and 8 elsewhere seem to be based on the aggregate sums as found in HR. My totals, where possible, are based on Ziegler's critical texts. In the case of Jer we both record 7 occurrences of παντοκράτωρ in Jer b', but Tov obtains this figure by including 37(30):3 attested by SAVC but rejected by Ziegler, while he fails to mention 38:36(31:35), a firmly attested occurrence of παντοκράτωρ. Tov's reference to παντοκράτωρ in Jer 29:29 must be corrected to 29:19.

10. σάβωθ

Josh 6:16(17)

1 Re 1:3,11,20 15:2 17:45

1 Esd 9:46

Is 1:9,24 2:12 3:1 5:7,9,16,24,25 6:3,5 7:7 8:18
9:7(6) 10:16,24,33 13:4,13 14:22,24,27 17:4 18:7,7 19:4,12,
16,25 21:10 22:5,12,14,15,17,25 23:9,11 25:6 28:5,22,29
29:6 31:4 37:16,32 39:5 44:6 45:13,14 47:4 48:2 51:15
54:5.

11. παντοκράτωρ

2 Re 5:10 7:8,25(MT v.26)27

3 Re 19:10,14

1 Chr 11:9 17:7,24

Sir 42:17

Hos 12:5 Am 3:13 4:13 5:14,15,16,27 9:5 Mi 4:4

Na 2:14 3:5 Hab 2:13 Zeph 2:10 Hag 1:2,5,7,9,14

2:4,6,7,8,9,9,11,23,23 Zech 1:3,4,6,12,14,16,17 2:8,

9,11,(MT 12,13,15) 3:7,9,10 4:6,9 5:4 6:12,15 7:3,

9,12,12,13 8:1,2,3,4,6,6,7,9,9,11,14,14,18,19,20,21,22,23

9:15 10:3 11:4 12:5 13:7 14:16,17,21,21 Mal 1:4,

6,8,9,10,11,12,14,17, 4:1,3 (MT 3:19,21)

Jer a' 3:19 5:14 15:16 23:16 27(50):34 28(51):5,57

Jer b' 29:15(45:18) 32:13(25:27) 38:36(31:35) 39(32):14,

19 40(33):11 51(44):7

Bar 3:1,4.

12. τῶν δυνάμεων

Josh 5:13(MT v.14 נצט)

2 Re 6:2,18

3 Re 17:1 18:15 4 Re 3:14 19:20,31

Ps 23(24):10 45(46):8,12 47(48):9 58(59):6 68(69):7

79(80):5,8,15,20 83(84):2,4,9,13 88(89):9.

13. Thackeray was aware of the rendition παντοκράτωρ running right through Jer and MP but could accomodate this to his multiple translator theory (Jewish Worship, p. 33).

14. These totals are based on Ziegler's text which means that for the purpose of our sums at least, we accept the elimination of τὰδε at 9:17, οὕτως at 21:7, while reading λέγει rather than εἶπεν at 29:13.

15. Comparison with Tov's statistics (p. 17) and mine reveals some discrepancies in the sums achieved. But since Tov does not give references for most of his totals it is impossible to check one against the other. His total of 49 instances of τὰδε λέγει in Reigns may include the formula at 1 Re 14:7 which however is found in a passage attested only by the A text among the uncials. For 2 Chr I count 6 rather than 5 occurrences of τὰδε λέγει while for MP I find 44 rather than 43. Where Tov does give references these are found to be incorrect in the following places: The translation of כה נאמר יהוה by τὰδε λέγει κύριος occurs in Jer 61 times not 58 times as stated by Tov, pp. 21, 56, 57. Tov's list on p. 56 fails to note the occurrences of τὰδε λέγει at 2:2,5 and 28:36. The totals for οὕτως εἶπε in Jer b' are 71 not 69; Tov fails to mention 34:13, 40:12, and 41:2(2nd occurrence), while his list includes Bar 2:21 (Bar references are not incorporated in our lists). Tov's total of 3 for οὕτως λέγει includes 21:7 where, however, the οὕτως is eliminated by Ziegler; it is strange to find Tov not following Ziegler here since in almost every other instance he does accept Ziegler's text.

16. τὰδε λέγει

Gen 45:9

Ex 4:22 5:1,10 7:17 8:1(7:26) 8:20(16) 9:1,13
10:3 11:4 32:27

Num 20:14 22:16

Josh 7:13 22:16 24:2

Jud 6:8 11:15

1 Re 2:27 2 Re 7:5,8 12:7,11 24:12

3 Re 2:30 11:31 12:24 13:2,21 17:14 20(21):19,19
21:2(3),5,13,14,28,42 22:11 4 Re 1:4,6,11,16 2:21 3:16,17
4:43 7:1 9:3,6,12,18,19 18:19,29,31 19:36,20,32 20:1,5
21:12 22:15,16,18

1 Chr 17:7 2 Chr 11:4 18:10 20:15 21:12 24:20 36:23

Am 1:6,9,11,13 2:1,4,6 3:11,12 5:3,4,16 7:11,17
Mi 2:3 3:5 Ob 1 Na 1:12 Hag 1:2,5,7 2:6,11 Zech 1:3,
4,14,16,17 2:8(12) 3:7 6:12 7:9 8:2,3,4,6,7,9,14,19,20,23
11:4 Mal 1:4

Is 7:7 10:24 22:15 29:22 36:4,14,16, 37:3,6,21
38:1,5 52:3 56:1,4 57:15 65:13 66:12

Jer a' 2:2,5,31 4:3,27 5:14 6:6,9,16,21,22 7:3,20,21

8:4 9:7,15,23(6,14,22) 10:2,18 11:3,11,21 12:14 13:1,8,13
 14:15 15:2,19 16:3,5,9 17:19,21 18:13 19:3,11,15 20:4
 21:4,8,12 22:1,3,6,11,18 23:2,15,38 24:5,8 25:15(49:35)
 27(50):18,33 28(51):1,33,36,58

Jer b' 29:1(47:2) 29:8,13 (49:7,12)

Ez 2:4 3:11,27 5:5,7,8 6:3,11 7:2,5 11:5,7,16,17
 12:10,19,23,28 13:3,8,13,18,20 14:4,6,21 15:6 16:3,36,59
 17:3,9,19,22 20:3,5,27,30,39,47(21:3), 21:9,24,26,28(14,29,
 31,33) 22:3,19,28 23:22,28,32,35,46 24:3,6,9,21 25:3,6,8,
 12,13,15,16 26:3,7,15,19 27:3 28:2,6,12,22,25 29:3,8,13,19
 30:2,10,13,22 31:10,15 32:3,11 33:27 34:2,10,11,17,20 35:3,14
 36:2,3,4,5,6,13,22,33,37 37:5,9,12,19,21 38:3,10,14,17 39:1,
 17,25 43:18 44:6,9 45:9,18 46:1,16 47:13.

17. οὕτως εἶπε

1 Chr 17:4 2 Chr 12:5 18:26 34:23

2 Esd 1:2

Is 18:4 21:6,16 31:4

Jer b' 30:1,6(49:1,28) 31(48):1,40 32:1,13,14,18
 (25:15,27,28,32) 33(26):2,4,18 43:1,3,13,16(27:2,4,16,19)
 35(28):2,11,13,14,16 36(29):4,8,10,21,31,32 37(30):2,5,12,18
 38(31):2,7,15,16,23,36(35) 39(32):3,14,15,28,36,42 40(33):2,
 4,10,12 41(34):2,2,13,17 42(35):17,18 43(36):29,30 44(37):7,
 9 45(38):2,3,17 46(39):16 49(42):9,15,18 50(43):10 51(44):2,
 7,11,25,30 51:32,34(45:2,4).

18. οὕτως λέγει

Gen 32:4(5)

Jud 11:15

1 Chr 21:10,11 2 Chr 34:24,26

Is 8:11 28:16 30:12,15 37:33 42:5 43:1,14,16
 44:2,6,24 45:1,11,14,18 48:17 49:7,8,22,25 50:1 51:22 52:4
 65:8 66:1

Jer a' 14:10 (21:7 lec. dup. acc. to Ziegler) 23:16

Jer b' 41(34):4 42(35):13.

19. The following is a list of the textual variants for the messenger formulas as found in Ziegler's apparatus:

Variants for τὰδε λέγει

4:3 οὕτως λέγει S*

13:1 οὕτως εἶπε(v) L = οἱ γ'

17:19 οὕτως εἶπε(v) L - 198 - 538

29:13 τὰδε εἶπεν B-S-538

Variants for οὕτως λέγει

14:10 τὰδε λέγει 86ms 710

23:16 οὕτως εἶπε(v) O-233 L

41:4 οὕτως εἶπε(v) O-86ms-233 L

42:13 οὕτως εἶπε(ν) O-233 L

Variants for οὕτως εἶπε

The form τὰδε λέγει is found in the L group (or part thereof) at 31:40 32:13,18 35:2,14 36:8,21 37:18 38:7,16 39:14,28,42 41:2,17 43:29 44:7,9 45:3 49:15,18 51:11,25.

The form οὕτως λέγει is found in miscellaneous MSS (indicated in the parentheses) at 35:2(233) 36:8(233) 36:22(534) 37:12(A 613) 38:16(233) 39:14(233) 40:12(Q-V+ OLC) 43:29(87^{ext}) 51:7(239).

Where the MF is missing in the LXX it has been supplied in O/L by τὰδε λέγει at 11:22 13:12 17:5 22:30 34:21 36:16,17,25 40:17,20,25 38:35 42:19 and by οὕτως λέγει at 18:11.

The most common variant in the above lists is the change in the L recension from the anomalous form οὕτως εἶπε to the standard usage τὰδε λέγει, not surprisingly, considering what is already known about the tendency of that recension to prefer a more natural Gk. The opposite tendency of changing τὰδε/οὕτως λέγει to οὕτως εἶπε is found in 13:1 17:19 23:16 41:4 42:13.

20. ταλαιπωρίῳ 4:13,20,20 9:19(18) 10:20 12:12
ὄλλυμι 29:11(49:10) 30(49):3 31(48):1,15,
 18,20 (Tov also includes 38(31):2 where MT has יַרְרַשׁ).
ἀπόλλυμι 29(47):4
(ἐξ)ολιθεύω 5:6 28(51):53,55
πλήσσω Q-613 Zi. 30:6(49:28).

21. ταλαιπωρία 6:7,26 15:8 20:8 28(51):56
ὄλεθρος 31(48):3,8,32.

22. μάχαιρα 2:30 4:10 5:12 9:16(15) 11:22
 12:12 14:12,13,15,16,18 15:2,2,3,9 16:4 18:21,21 19:7
 20:4,4 21:7,7,9 24:10 25:17(49:37) 26(46):10,14,16 27(50):16,
 21,35,36,36,37,37, 29(47):6 31(48):2,10 32:2,13,15,17,24,
 (25:16,27,30,31,38) 33(26):23 34:6(27:8) 38(31):2 39(32):24,
 36 41(34):17

ρόμφαία 5:17 6:25 45(38):2 46(39):18
 49(42):16,17,22 50(43):11,11 51(44):12,13,18,27,28.

23. ρόμφαία 195; μάχαιρα 166.

24. μάχαιρα Gen 22:6,10 27:40 31:26 34:25,26
 48:22 Ex 15:9 17:13 22:24(23) Lev 26:8,25,33 Num 14:43
 21:24 22:29,31 Deut 13:15(16) 20:13 32:25,41,42 33:29
 Josh 5:2,3 10:11, 19:47 21:42^a 24:30^a

ρόμφαία Gen 3:24 Ex 5:21 32:27 Num 22:23
 31:8 Josh 5:12(13) 6:20(21) 8:24 24:12.

25. μάχηρα Ez 5:2,12 26:6,8,9,11,15 28:7,23
30:4,5,6,11,17,21,22 31:17,18 32:12,19,21,23,24,26,27,28,29,
30,31,32, 33:27 35:5,8 38:4,8,21 39:23.

ρομφαία Ez 5:1,2,12,17 6:3,8,11,12 7:15
11:8,10 12:14,16 14:17,21 21:9,11,12,14,15,19,20,28 23:10,25
24:21 29:8,10 30:24,25 30:10,11 33:2,3,4,6.

26. ἐντέλλομαι 1:7,17 7:22,23,23,31 11:4,4 13:5,6
14:14 17:22 19:5 23:32 27(50):21 28(51):59 29(47):7 39(32):23
42(35):6,10,14,18 43(36):5,8,26 45(38):10,27

συντάσσω 33(26):2,8 34(27):3(4) 36(29):23
39(32):13,35 41(34):22 44(37):21.

27. καίρος / εν 2:27,28 3:17 4:11 5:24 6:15 8:1,
7,15 10:15 11:12,14,14(MT εν) 14:8,19 15:11,11 18:23 26(46):21
27(50):4,16,20,27,31 28(51):6,18

χρόνος / εν 29:9(49:8) 37(30):7 38(31):1.

28. Biblical Words for Time, ²1969, elaborating a point made by G.B. Caird in The Apostolic Age, p. 184, n. 2.

29. Op. cit., p. 37; for further remarks on the words for "time" in the LXX cf. pp. 125-127.

30. Origen tried to guess at the meaning of the word: ἐπίκειρον
ἢ τὸ σκῆπτρον περίστησιν ἢ τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἢ τοὺς
μισθωτοὺς, ἐπίκειρα γὰρ ὁ μισθός
Ghisler II 841 (not 481 as in Schleusner, Tov, p.83, n. 30).

31. We call these "concluding formulas" because this is their main, though certainly not their only, function, cf. R. Rendorff, ZAW 66 (1954), 28.

32. Again the statistics are based on Ziegler's text which means reading λέγει at 1:19 and 2:3 (against the majority text witnesses), taking 21:7 as a concluding formula by eliminating οὕτως, and considering λέγει κύριος at 23:29 a double reading. The totals include all occurrences of the Gk formula whether or not a corresponding formula is found in the MT.

As often, my figures differ slightly from those of Tov. He lists a total of 71 references for λέγει κύριος; my total is 75 (Tov omits the second occurrence of the formula at 2:19, 3:12 and 38(31):35; also he neglects to mention the occurrences at 8:13 and 25:19). Under the reference for φησὶ κύριος Tov fails to mention 34:12.

λέγει κύριος 1:8,15,17,19 2:2,3,9,12,17,19,19,22,29
3:1,12,12,13,14,16,20 4:1,9,17 5:1,9,15,18,22,29 6:12 7:11,
19,30,32 8:1,13 9:9,24,25(8,23,24) 13:14,25 15:3,6 16:1,11,
14,16 17:24 19:6,12 21:7 22:5,16,24 23:4,5,23,24,30,33,7
25:19(49:39) 26(46):5,18,23,28 27(50):20,21,31 28(51):24,26,
39,52,53,57 29:14(49:13) 32:17(25:31) 34:18(27:22) 51:35(45:5)

φησὶ κύριος 30(49):2,15 31(48):12,35,38 34:12(27:15)
36(29):23 37(30):3,17,21 38(31):20,27,28,31,32,33,35,35,37(37,
37,36),38 41(34):22 46(39):18 49(42):11

(27:8) εἶπε κύριος 30:5,10(49:5,32) 27(50):30,40 34:6
37(30):8 38(31):1 41(34):5

33. λέγει is changed to φησὶν in sundry MSS at 2:3 3:16 22:16 25:19 28:26 34:18 it is changed to εἶπεν in some MSS at 1:8,17,19 19:12 27:31.

φησὶ is changed to λέγει in various MSS at 30:2,15 31:12 36:23 37:3,21 38:27,31,32,35,37,38 49:11, and to εἶπεν at 41:22.

εἶπε is changed to λέγει in some MSS at 27:30 34:6 37:8 41:5, and to φησὶν at 27:30 30:10.

When the formula יהוה אמר is missing in the LXX (as it frequently is) it is usually added in the O and L recension (sometimes in conjunction with a few other MSS). The most common form of the addition by far is φησὶν κύριος (65x: 3:10 5:11 7:16 8:17 9:3,6 12:17 13:11 15:9,20 16:15 18:6 21:10,13,14 23:1,2,11,12,28,31,32,32 25:7,9,12,17,18 27:4,20,35 28:48 29:17 30:2,5,8,9 31:15,25,30,43,44,47 32:15 34:9 35:4 36:9,11,14,14,19,19 37:11 38:14,16,17,34 39:5,30,44 40:14 41:17 42:13 46:17 51:29); sometimes we find the form λέγει κύριος (7x: 8:3 15:21 23:29 27:10 28:25,48 36:32); and occasionally even εἶπεν κύριος (3x: 8:12 26:25 38:14).

34. Cf. Tov, p. 89, n. 110. In the list of references to εἶπε κύριος as renditions of יהוה אמר Tov neglects to mention 29:19(49:18) and 40(33):11.

35. ἀφανισμός 9:11(10) 10:22 12:11,11 18:16
19:8 25:9,11,12 26(46):19 27(50):3,13,23 28(51):26,29,37,
41,62

ἀβατος 6:8 12:10 28(51):43 29:14,18(49:13,
17) 30:11(49:33) 31(48):9 32:4,24(25:18,38) 39(32):43
49(42):18 51(44):6,22. Cf. also 30(49):2 (המהו הנה)

ἐρημος 2:15 4:27 41(34):22

ἐρημωσις 4:7

ἐκστασις 5:30

ἀπορία 8:21

ἀπώλεια 30(49):2 51(44):12.

36. ἀφανίζω 12:11 27(50):45

ἀβατόω 29:21(49:20)

ἐρημόω 10:25 40(33):10

ἐξίστημι 2:12 4:9 18:16

σκυθρωπάζω 19:8 27(50):13.

37. Cf. Reider-Turner, pp. 1 and 37.

38. κατασκηνώ 7:12 17:6 23:6 28(51):13

<u>καταλύω</u>	29:17(49:16) 30:9(49:31) 32:10(25:24)
<u>κατοικίζω</u>	7:3,7
<u>οἰκέω</u>	31(48):28.

39. There is a further difficulty in considering καταλύω a "synonymous rendition" to κατασκηνύω in 29:17(49:16). The sense demanded for καταλύω in the context of 29:17 is that of "destroy" or "demolish" (Bagster:"burst"), rather than that of "lodge" as in the Heb. Is it reasonable to assume that a reviser, anxious to bring the Gk text into better conformity with the Heb, would replace a perfectly logical translation choice (κατασκηνύω) with another word (καταλύω) which in the syntax of the sentence gave it a meaning quite different from that of the Heb?

40. It was, in fact, this passage which Spohn already in 1794 pointed to as indicating different translators (Ieremias vates, p. 9).

41.	<u>νομή</u>	10:25 23:3,10 27(50):7,19,45
	<u>τόπος</u>	29:20(49:19) 32:16(25:30)
	<u>κατάλυσις</u>	29:21(49:20)
	<u>κατάλυμα</u>	40(33):12.
42.	<u>κατὰ πρόσωπον</u>	18:17,20 24:1 27(50):8,44 29:20
(49:19)	33(26):4 37(30):20 38:37(31:36) 41(34):15,18 42	
(35):5,19	43(36):7,9,22 44(37):20 47(40):10 49(42):2 51	
(44):10	52:12,33	
	<u>πρὸ πρόσωπον</u>	9:13(12) 15:1,19 21:8
	<u>εἰς πρόσωπον</u>	30(49):5
	<u>ἐναντίον</u>	1:17 2:22 15:9 18:23 19:7 25:17
(49:37)	47(40):10	
	<u>ἐνώπιον</u>	7:10
	<u>πρότερος</u>	35(28):8,8 41(34):5.
43.	<u>σεῖω</u>	8:16 27(50):46 28(51):29
	<u>φοβέομαι</u>	29:22(49:21).
44.	<u>ἰσχυρός</u>	5:16 9:23(22) 26(46):5,6 29:23
(49:22)	31(48):14 39(32):12	
	<u>μαχητής</u>	20:11 26(46):9,12,12 27(50):9,36
28(51):30,56		
	<u>δυνατός</u>	48(41):16 50(43):6 51(44):20
	<u>ἐνὶ ἡρ</u>	14:9.

45. On p. 5 and p. 20 Tov states that the reviser theory must be correct "by implication" if it can be shown that Thackeray's explanation of the agreements between Jer a' and b' is incorrect.

On p. 6: "It seems to us that the agreements between the two sections of Jer (chapter II) are of such a nature that the two-translator theory cannot be sustained."

On p. 42: "We have attempted to demonstrate in the preceding chapter that Jer a' and b' exhibit many important agreements which make a two-translator theory untenable."

On p. 45: "We suggest our working hypothesis in spite of the mentioned difficulties because the agreements discussed in ch. II do not seem to leave any other possible explanation of the differences between Jer a' and b'."

46. See his remark on p. 8: "While the examples of chapter III are supposed to demonstrate that Jer b' has been revised, the examples of chapter IV can also be taken as proof of a two-translator theory. However . . . the data provided in this chapter can be accommodated to our working hypothesis."

47. On Ch. V, p. 112: "It should be pointed out that this chapter provides no additional proof that Jer b' is a revision rather than a second translation."

On Ch. VI, p. 135: "Although the majority of the new translation equivalents of Jer-R are revisional, the examples themselves do not provide additional proof that the second part of Jer contains a revision rather than a different translation."

48. See, for example, Part I of Memory and Manuscript by G. Gerhardsson (Uppsala, 1961) for an interesting study of the role of memory within Judaism.

49. See the note by P.D.M. Turner "ANOIKODOMEIN and Intra-Septuagintal Borrowing", VT 27 (1977), 492-493 as well as other unpublished studies by her along the same lines (e.g. "Unravelling the Internal History of the Septuagint: A New Method Exemplified", paper read at OT Seminar, Cambridge University, Feb. 1977).

50. Tov is forthright about the limitations inherent in his study. For instance, he says, "Our explanations of these difficulties may or may not be correct. In any event, we prefer the uneasy assumption outlined above over the "easy" two-translator theory suggested by Thackeray (p. 6). Similarly, "We cannot claim that our suggestion is without difficulty. There are too many gaps in our knowledge. However, if we pause for a moment and assume that the theory is correct" (p. 168). Such candor is refreshing.

51. Nor is the case similar to our argument for a pre-Hexaplaric revision underlying the Q text since in the latter instance the argument proceeds entirely from extant MSS readings.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. It was an important part of A.P. Haustoupis' dissertation to show that many of the divergencies attributed to the LXX and MT texts of Jer were simply due to the lack of a trustworthy LXX edition of Jer. Cf. also W. Rudolph's article in ZAW 7 (1930), esp. 272-281.

2. G. Vermes has expressed himself to the effect that unless the matter is dealt with promptly the discovery threatens to become "the academic scandal par excellence of the twentieth century", The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, 1977, p. 24.

3. On 2QJer see DJD, III, 62-69. On 4QJer^a and 4QJer^c Cross comments that they contain a text "with virtually no significant deviations from the traditional text", QHBT, p. 308, a statement which may be verified at least with regard to 4QJer^a in Janzen's Appendix, pp. 174-181. For a discussion of the date (c. 200 B.C.) and orthographic features of 4QJer^a, see Cross JBL 74 (1955), esp. 162-164, BANE, pp. 145-153, and QHBT, p. 316, n. 8. See also D.N. Freedman, Textus 2 (1962), 87-102.

4. The attention of the scholarly community at large was first alerted to the existence of this MS, together with a preliminary publication of part of one fragment in Cross' book, The Ancient Library of Qumran, 1958, p. 139, n. 38 (1961, p. 187, n. 38). The MS is of slightly later date (the Hasmonean period) than 4QJer^a (QHBT, p. 308).

5. It is recognized, of course, that 4QJer^b is not an isolated phenomenon in the entire range of LXX-Qumran studies. The Samuel scrolls from Qumran in particular have furnished evidence for an LXX-type Heb text on a much larger scale than 4QJer^b. By analogy, this would tend to increase our confidence in extrapolating from the small fragments of Jer, but arguments from analogy in these cases have to be handled with caution, as Goshen-Gottstein has reminded us (The Book of Isaiah: Sample Edition with Introduction, 1965, p. 14). Also, D.W. Gooding has made the point that, depending on whether the Heb Vorlage of the LXX of Jer and 4QJer^b are regarded as members of a close-knit Family or merely of a broad text-type, the range in possible agreements between the LXX and 4QJer^b had it survived in full could easily vary anywhere from as high as 95 per cent to, say, 60 per cent (JSS 21 (1976), 23-24).

6. The same point regarding concurrent expansion and contraction was also made by W.G. Lambert and A.R. Millard in their book Atra-ḥasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood, 1969, cf. p. 38.

7. The Descent of Manuscripts, Oxford, 1918.

8. The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, 1914;
The Acts of the Apostles, Oxford, 1933.

9. Gk renditions of the main introductory formulas:

a) הדבר אשר היה אל ירמיהו מלת יהוה

This formula is rendered literally $\delta\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in 37(30):1, 41(34):1,8, 42(35):1, also in 11:1, 18:1, 21:1, 39(32):1, 47(40):1, but in the latter instances with $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ inverted. On two occasions the same formula is found without $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and the LXX follows suit in 25:1 and 51(44):1. On one occasion the formula is entirely missing in the Gk along with most of the following verse (for discussion of this see pp. 228-229).

b) ויהי דבר יהוה אלי

The construction is rendered literally $\epsilon\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in 1:11,13, 13:8, 18:5, and 24:4. At 1:4 the LXX reads $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ instead of $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. For the omission of the formula in 2:1 and 16:1 see p. 228 and pp. 229-230.

c) ויהי דבר יהוה אל ירמיהו

This formula is identical with the foregoing except that it replaces $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ with $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. The normal Gk translation, as expected, is $\epsilon\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ 35(28):12, 36(29):30, 40(33):1, 41(34):2 (MT adds $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ which LXX omits), 43(36):27, 44(37):6 (MT adds $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, om. LXX), 49(42):7. On two occasions the Gk has $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ instead of $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ 39(32):26, 42(35):12. The formulas in MT 33:19;23 are missing in the LXX as part of the long passage vv. 14-26 absent from LXX Jer 40.

d) ויאמר יהוה אלי

This formula is consistently rendered $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in 1:12,14, 3:6,11, 11:6,9, 13:6, 14:11,14, 15:1, and 24:3.

e) הדבר אשר דבר/ צוה ...

This formula is found in four places in the OAN section of the book: 26(46):13, 27(50):1, 28(51):59, and 51:31(45:1), but only in the latter instance does the Gk follow the Heb exactly.

f) ... היה הדבר היה (אל ירמיהו) מלת יהוה

There are three closely related headings which contain this phrase: 33(26):1, 34(27):1, and 43(36):1. The LXX omits the formula in 34(27):1 while it attests minor variants in the other two verses. The omission of the introduction in 34(27):1 may be related to the problematic mention of $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in MT 27:1 which contradicts the content of the succeeding verses dealing with Zedekiah. The usual approach has been to emend Jehoiakim to Zedekiah (with some Heb MSS, Syr, and Arab), but Janzen regards

MT 27:1 secondary from MT 26:1 (p. 14, # 24).

g) Miscellaneous introductory headings are found in 36(29):1, 37(30):4, and 46(39):15 where the LXX follows the MT exactly; in 1:1-2 and 39(32):6 the LXX diverges more significantly.

10. For the Gk translation of these see the preceding chapter, pp. 189-191, notes 16, 17, 18.

11. Missing on its own: 11:22 13:12 18:11 22:30 36(29):25 38:35(31:37) 42(35):19;
Missing as part of a larger context: 17:5 34(27):21 36(29):16,17 40(33):17,20,25.

12. This figure includes the expression כֹּה נִשְׁמָח יְהוָה of MT 9:21. For Gk translations see preceding chapter, p. , n. 32.

13. Missing on its own: 3:10 5:11 7:13 8:3,17 9:3(2),6(5) 12:17 13:11 15:9,20 18:6 21:10,13 23:1,2,11,12,24,28,29, 31,32,32 25:17,18(49:37,38) 27(50):4,10,35 28(51):25 29:17(49:16) 30:5,8,9(49:6,30,31) 31(48):25,30,43,44 32:15(25:29) 34:9(27:11) 36(29):9,11 38(31):14,16,17,34 39(32):44 41(34):17 42(35):13 46(39):17 51(44):29;
Missing as part of a phrase: 9:22(21) 16:5 21:14 25:7,9,12 35(28):4 36(29):14,14,32 39(32):5,30;
Missing as part of verses unrepresented in the LXX: (MT references) 29:19,19 30:10,11 33:14 46:26 48:47 49:6 51:48.

14. Translated by εἰπε κύριος in 6:15
29:19(49:18) + παντοκράτωρ 31(48):8 37(30):3 40(33):11,13 51(44):26.

15. Missing on its own in 30(49):2 and as part of a larger context in 8:12.

16. 6:6,9 9:6,16 19:11 23:15 25:8,28,32 26:18 27:19 33:12 49:7,35 50:33 51:58.

17. 23:16.

18. 11:22 29:17(49:16).

19. 21:4 23:2 40(33):4 49(42):9 41(34):2,13 51:32(45:2) 44(37):7.

20. 11:3 24:5 32:1(25:15) 37(30):2 39(32):36.

21. 13:22.

22. 5:14.

23. 7:21 19:15 27(50):18 28(51):33 31(48):1 35(28):2,14 36(29):8,21 38(31):23 39(32):15 42(35):13,18 49(42):15,18 50(43):10 51(44):11.

24. 7:3 9:15 16:9 19:3 34:3(27:4) 36(29):4 46(39):16
51(44):2,25

25. 32:13(25:27) 39(32):14

26. 34(27):21 36(29):25 42(35):19

27. 42(35):17 45(38):17

28. 51(44):7

29. 5:14 15:16 23:16 27(50):34 28(51):5,57 32:13(25:27)
38:36(31:35) 39(32):14 40(33):11 51(44):7

30. Janzen's statistics in these tables are generally reliable, though it is to be regretted that he seldom gives references, thus making verification difficult. Some corrections, that need to be made are the following:

In Table B.1, in the column labeled "Other",

for 1 Is כה אמר אדני יהוה קדש ישראל read כה אמר אדני יהוה קדש ישראל

for Ez כה אמר האל יהוה read כה אמר האל יהוה

for 2 Is כה אמר מלך ישראל read כה אמר מלך יהוה

" כה אמר אדני יהוה ואלהיך read כה אמר אדני יהוה ואלהיך

In Table B.3, in the column labeled "Other",

for 2 Is אמר מרחמך יהוה read אמר מרחמך יהוה

On p. 159 in the column labeled "Other",

for נִסְקָטָא וְנִצְלָא וְנִסְקָטָא read נִסְקָטָא וְנִצְלָא וְנִסְקָטָא

Also on p. 159 there are 9 (not 8) occurrences of the formula אמר יהוה in the MT.

According to Janzen's remark on p. 78, the statistics for the divine name are given in Tables B.3, B.4, and B.5. But no tables B.4 and B.5 are found. It seems clear that a title is missing at the top of p. 159 which should read "Table B.4, In Jeremiah" (compare B.3 "אמר יהוה" and "אמר יהוה" Outside Jeremiah"). As for Table B.5 there is nothing in Appendix B corresponding to this.

31. All the Eng VSS consulted--except NEB--translate the -ל construction לִי־אֵל in the normal way as indirect object of the infinitive construction לִי־אֵל . NEB, however, takes this as a direct object, "... because the day is upon them when Philistia will be despoiled and Tyre and Sidon destroyed to the last defender". It is difficult to defend the NEB in this translation. Not only is it contrary to normal classical Hebrew usage but, like the LXX, it breaks the unity of the composition by deflecting the poem from its otherwise single-minded preoccupation with the Philistines (was NEB influenced by the LXX?).

32. Such an alliance after 605 B.C. is not otherwise known in historical sources, but its existence is quite plausible (see Bright, AB, p. 310).

33. The Heb is admittedly difficult. Literally it translates, "every survivor, helper". By taking לִי־אֵל in the sense of "escapee" ("Entronnener") instead of "survivor", Duhm (p. 344) declared the phrase "blanker Unsinn". But this verdict is surely extreme. Volz (p. 302) is much more sober in his estimate that in a passage which is poetically terse, the expression can be taken as a case of asyndetic apposition (cf. GK, 131b,c) and hence proposes the translation "jeden Ubrigen, nämlich Bundesgenossen". The RSV translation "every remaining ally" reflects this reasonable interpretation.

34. Compare the frequent use of אֵל־לִי־אֵל in vv. 4-7. In v. 4b and v. 5 it translates אֵל־לִי־אֵל ; in v. 7 the Gk phrase ἰσχυροὶ καὶ ἀνδρείοι, ἡρώες, ἰσχυροὶ καὶ ἀνδρείοι mysteriously represents MT אֵל־לִי־אֵל, suggesting again a very free use of אֵל־לִי־אֵל.

35. It has commonly been regarded as a gloss by the commentators, cf. Movers (p. 22), Fried. Delitzsch (Lese und Schreibfehler, p. 137), Schwally (p. 195, n. 3), Giesebrecht (p. 234), Streane (p. 267), Duhm (p. 344), Cornill (p. 460).

36. This explanation was first proposed by Giesebrecht (p. 234).

37. By means of this emendation, Christensen translates "How long will you whirl about, O sword of Yahweh?", omitting הָיִי with the LXX. But the emendation following 2QJer must be rejected out of hand; it is completely insensitive to the parallels in Deut 14.1, Jer 16.6, 48.37 cited. Moreover, 2QJer does not endorse the linking of הָיִי with הָיִי since הָיִי is firmly attested by that MS. הָיִי is undoubtedly secondary in 2QJer (cf. the variant הָיִי (text הָיִי) in some Heb MSS at 5:7). The example is typical of the many arbitrary emendations of the MT in Christensen's work (e.g. in MT 49:3 he emends the Heb in the opposite direction: MT הָיִי → הָיִי p. 225). The same spirit prevails in the article, "Jeremiah 49.28-33; An Oracle Against a Proud Desert Power", by W.J. Dumbrell (The Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology, 2 (1972), 99-109), which acknowledges indebtedness

both to Christensen and Janzen. In the works of Christensen and Dumbrell the ghost of Duhm has reappeared to haunt the interpretation of Jeremiah's poetry. The simple invocation of metri causa is apparently sufficient to justify a multitude of the most arbitrary emendations. From the same school, see the more sober comment by D.K. Stuart, Studies in Early Hebrew Meter, 1976, "Emendation may rarely be attempted metri causa alone" (p. 22). The NEB admits the 2QJer reading יָרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָרְרָR into its footnote register, cf. Brockington, p. 213.

38. Contra H.M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators", HUCA 26 (1975), 89-114, esp. 109-110.

39. For a discussion of the inner-Gk textual problems associated with the word κρυπτός see Ch. 3 above, pp. 156-7.

40. Rahlfs's retention of σολ following ῥαθον in the body of the text is indefensible on text-critical grounds. See Ch. 3, p. 155.

41. 3:22? (Ziegler emends to οἶδε), 4:24 8:8,9 24:1 25:15(49:35) 27(50):12 29:13,16(49:12,15) 32:15(25:29) 37(30):23 39(32):17,24,27 41(34):2.

42. Participle-verb constructions (26 occurrences): 3:1 4:10 5:11 6:15 7:5,5 10:5 12:16 13:12 14:19 22:4 26(46):28 28(51):58 32:14(25:28) 33(26):15 33(26):19 38(31):18,20 43(36):16,29 44(37):9 45(38):3,17 46(38):18 48(42):10 49(42):19 51(44):17;

Noun-verb constructions (13 occurrences): 9:4(3) 17:24 22:10 23:32 26(46):5 27(50):34? 28(51):56? 31(48):9 33(26):8 39(32):4 41(34):3 45(38):15 47(40):14.

43. Jer α : 11:12 20:15 (Gk has participle only) 23:17,39; Jer β : 29:13(49:12) 32:15(25:29) 48(41):6,15.

In addition to the preceding verses where the Gk attests only half of the Heb inf. abs. construction, there are also two occasions where the Gk omits the entire construction: 13:17 and 49(42):22. Then, of course, there are those occasions where the Gk construction is missing as part of a larger context missing in the LXX: 6:15 11:7 28(51):57 37(30):11 51(44):29. On yet other occasions the Gk translates in anomalous ways, e.g. 6:9,29 8:13 25:30(32:16) 51(44):25(3x). The last mentioned verse has three examples of the Gk infinitive with finite verb, the closest approximation possible to the MT but the worst possible Gk (these examples should be added to the lone instance of this phenomenon discovered by Thackeray in Josh 18:13, "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX", p. 600; Grammar, p. 47). Finally there are those occasions where the Gk has the typical construction associated with a Heb inf. abs. but where it is missing in the MT: 3:1 12:11 22:24 28(51):57 39(32):28 41(34):2.

44. Compare the different vocabulary ῥαθον / κρυπτός and the different constructions, participle-verb/noun-verb.

45. For a useful discussion of the significance of this series in relation to the problem of Deuteronomic prose-form in Jer, see the discussion by H. Weippert, pp. 187-91.

46. Since a series implies more than one, only those passages of two or more terms are included in the above list. However, there are also numerous instances where the same construction is used with only one term, לשמה being the most popular. In the Edom oracle cf. 29:14(49:13) $\text{לְחַרְבּוֹתָא וְיִסְמְרוּ / וְיִשְׁמְרוּ}$ and 29:18(49:17) $\text{לְחַרְבּוֹתָא וְיִסְמְרוּ / וְיִשְׁמְרוּ}$. Even where the Heb is lacking the ל prefix, the Gk often translates as though it were present, e.g., 9:11(10) $\text{לְחַרְבּוֹתָא וְיִסְמְרוּ / וְיִשְׁמְרוּ}$. On occasions a Gk series is created even where none exists in the Heb, e.g. 30(49):2 $\text{לְחַרְבּוֹתָא וְיִסְמְרוּ / וְיִשְׁמְרוּ}$.

47. If לְחַרְבּוֹתָא is to be regarded as secondary, perhaps the source of the reading is not 25:18--which is after all subsequent to 25:11--but rather the very similar phrase in 7:34 $\text{וְהָיְתָה כִּי לְחַרְבּוֹתָא תִּהְיֶה הָאָרֶץ}$ (cf. 25:11 $\text{וְהָיְתָה לְחַרְבּוֹתָא לְשָׂמָה}$).

48. For another example of the translator's awareness of the contemporary situation, see the discussion on the omission of בְּיָמָיו in 29(47):4, p.64 above. However, the argument from Tendenz is admittedly vulnerable here (i.e. in 32:4(25:18)), since in the very similar passage of 51(44):22, the LXX does attest the translation of

49. Textus 8 (1973), 26.

50. The rendition of לשמה by אַנְטִי־כְרִיִּים is irregular since the normal Gk equivalent for לשמה in Jer b' is אַנְטִי־כְרִיִּים (Jer a' אַנְטִי־כְרִיִּים). The word is indeed found once elsewhere, 30(49):2, apparently as a translation for לשמה but the passage is ambiguous.

51. This is the simplest explanation for the LXX reading אַנְטִי־כְרִיִּים in this verse.

52. Taking the approach that "Das Nomen לְחַרְבּוֹתָא (Jer 29:9, 11, 18 44:22 49:13) ist in diesem Zusammenhang auffällig; denn es lässt sich thematisch nur schwer mit den anderen Begriffen zusammenbringen", H. Weippert (p. 189, n. 364) thinks this is the reason why the LXX omitted the verb in 25:11 and why it read לְחַרְבּוֹתָא instead of לְחַרְבּוֹתָא in 25:9. She does not comment on the LXX omission of לְחַרְבּוֹתָא in MT 49:13, but presumably would apply a similar explanation. As has been pointed out, however, it is questionable whether the distinction between לְחַרְבּוֹתָא and the other terms is as radical as Weippert suggests, and even if it were to exist, it is doubtful that the translator would have been alert to it. לְחַרְבּוֹתָא is well attested in Jer both on its own as well as in series and relates without great difficulty to the other terms, so that an explanation from Tendenz as the reason for the omission in the Gk does not seem persuasive in these cases.

53. For a discussion of the textual problems connected with the B-S reading $\Theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ see Ch. 3, pp. 170-172 .

54. Compare the interchange of τ and γ in the parallel passages, Ps 18:11 ($\gamma\gamma\gamma$) and 2 Sam 22:11 ($\gamma\gamma\gamma$), as well as in the Samaritan variant $\gamma\gamma\gamma$ to Deut 28:49 (in the LXX rendered $\omicron\rho\eta\mu\alpha$).

55. The verb $\gamma\gamma\gamma$ occurs only four times in the OT: Deut 28:49, Ps 18:11 and the parallel passages of Jer 48:40 // 49:22. In Deut 28:49 it was translated $\omicron\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ (see previous note), in Ps 17(18):11 by $\pi\iota\sigma\iota\mu\iota$, simply repeating the translation of the previous verb $\gamma\gamma\gamma$.

56. In the LXX the verses are absent from their MT position within the chapter (i.e. following v. 6) but do appear at the end of the chapter.

57. On account of the different chapter arrangement in the two texts, the omitted portion of the last two doublets cited is the second member of the pair when read in the Gk text only.

58. Janzen cites only eight examples, but he surely intends these to be representative rather than exhaustive. Other examples of larger duplicates that might easily be added are 7:31-32//19:5-6, 16:14-15//23:7-8, 23:5-6//33:15-16, 39:1-10//52:4-16. For useful lists giving most examples of duplicates in Jer, large and small, see Kuenan, p. 253 and Driver, ILOT, p. 259.

59. Since the appearance of Janzen's study, another thesis has been written on the subject (unavailable to me): Y-J. Min, The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text, Jerusalem, 1977.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
of works cited in the text

- Aland, K. Repertorium der Griechischen Christlichen Papyri: I, Biblische Papyri (Patristische Texte und Studien) Berlin/New York, 1976.
- Albright, W.F. From Stone Age to Christianity, New York, 1957 (reprint of 1946 edition).
- Idem, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible", BASOR 140 (Dec. 1955), 27-33 (=QHAT 140-146).
- Allen, L.C. The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text (SupVT 25 and 27).
- Arieti, J.A. "The Vocabulary of Septuagint Amos", JBL 93 (1974), 338-347.
- Baab, O.J. "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis", JBL 52 (1933), 239-243.
- Baillet, M., Milik, J.T., de Vaux, R. eds. Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran. Textes and Planches. DJD, 3, Oxford, 1962.
- Barr, J. Biblical Words for Time₂ (Studies in Biblical Theology, First Series, 33), London, 1969.
- Idem, Review of P. Walters' The Text of the Septuagint, HJ 26 (1975), 61-63; also VT 25 (1975), 248-254.
- Barthélemy, D. "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante", RB 40 (1953), 18-29 (=QHBT 127-139).
- Idem, Les Devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécapropheton (SupVT 10), Leiden, 1963.
- Idem, "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11,2 - 1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des 'Devanciers d'Aquila'", in 1972 Proceedings (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2), ed. R.A. Kraft, Missoula, Montana, 1972, pp. 16-89.
- von Baudissin, W.W.G. Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte, 4 vols., Giessen, 1926-29.
- Baumgärtel, F. "Zu den Gottesnamen in den Büchern Jeremia und Ezechiel", Verbannung und Heimkehr (FS W. Rudolph), ed. by A. Kuschke, Tübingen, 1961, pp. 1-29.

- Bertholdt, L. Historischkritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanonische und apokryphische Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 1812-1819.
- Biblia Patristica. Index des Citations et Allusions Bibliques dans la Littérature Patristique: Des origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien (Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques) Paris, 1975.
- Black, M. "Notes on the Longer and Shorter Text of Acts", On Language, Culture, and Religion, FS Eugene A. Nida, ed. Matthew Black and William A. Smalley, The Hague/Paris, 1974, pp. 119-131.
- Botte, B. Review of Ziegler's critical edition of Jeremiah in Recherches de Theologie Ancienne et Medievale 25 (1958), 147-148.
- Bright, J. Jeremiah (Anchor Bible 21), New York, 1965.
- Brock, S.P. The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel, Unpublished thesis, Oxford, 1966.
- Brockington, L.H. The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament: The Readings Adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible, Oxford/Cambridge, 1973.
- Brooke, A.E. and McLean, N. (from 1927 also Thackeray, H.St.J.) The Old Testament in Greek, Cambridge, 1906-1940.
- Brown, F., Driver, S.R., and Briggs, C.A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1953.
- Burkitt, F.C. "Text and Versions: Old Testament", EB, IV, 1903, cols. 5011-5031.
- Caird, G.B. The Apostolic Age, London, 1955.
- Ceriani, A.M. Monumenta Sacra et Profana, ex codicibus praesertim bibliotheca Ambrosiane, Vols. 1-3, Milan, 1861-63.
- Idem, "Le recensioni dei LXX e la versione latina detta Itala", R. Istituto Lombardo, Milan, 1886.
- Idem, De codice Marchaliano seu Vaticano graeco 2125 Prophetarum, phototypica arte repraesentato commentatio, Rome, 1890.
- Childs, B. "A Study of the Formula, 'Until This Day'", JBL 82 (1963), 279-92.
- Idem, Old Testament Books for Pastor and Teacher, Philadelphia, 1977.
- Christensen, D.L. Transformations of the War Oracle in Old Testament Prophecy: Studies in the Oracles Against the Nations (Harvard Theological Review: Harvard Dissertations in Religion 3), Missoula, Montana, 1975.

Clark, A.C. The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, 1914.

Idem, The Descent of Manuscripts, Oxford, 1918.

Idem, The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages, Oxford, 1933.

Colwell, E.C. "Method of Grouping New Testament Manuscripts", in Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament (New Testament Tools and Studies 9), Leiden, 1969, pp. 1-25. Originally published under the title "The Significance of Grouping of New Testament Manuscripts", NTS 4 (1958), 73-92.

Idem, "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings", in Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament (New Testament Tools and Studies 9), Leiden, 1969, pp. 96-105.

Condamin, A. Le Livre de Jérémie (Etudes Bibliques), Paris, 1936.

Cornill, C.H. Das Buch Jeremia, Leipzig, 1905.

Coste, E. Die Weissagungen des Propheten Jeremias wider die fremden Völker, Leipzig, 1895.

Cross, F.M. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran", JBL 74 (1955), 147-172 (= QHBT, pp. 147-176).

Idem, The Ancient Library of Qumran, London, 1958, ²1961.

Idem, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts", BANE, London, 1961, pp. 133-202.

Idem, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert", HTR 57 (1964), 281-299 (= QHBT, pp. 177-195).

Idem, "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text", IEJ 16 (1966), 81-95 (= QHBT, pp. 278-290).

Idem, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts", QHBT, pp. 306-320.

Cross, F.M. and Talmon, S., eds. Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text, Cambridge, Mass./London, 1975.

Dahood, M. Review of J.G. Janzen's book, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 1973, in Biblica 56 (1975), 429-31.

Driver, S.R. "The Double Text of Jeremiah", Expositor 9 (1889), 321-337.

Idem, The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, London, 1906.

- Idem, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, Oxford, 1913.
- Duhm, B. Das Buch Jeremia (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament 11) Tübingen/ Leipzig, 1901.
- Dumbrell, W.J. "Jeremia 49:28-33; An Oracle Against a Proud Desert Power", The Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology 2 (1972), 99-109.
- Duval, E. "Le texte grec de Jérémie d'après une étude récente", RB 12 (1903), 394-403.
- Ehrlich, A.B. Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel, IV, Leipzig, 1912.
- Eichhorn, J.G. Einleitung das Alte Testament, III, Leipzig, 1803.
- Eissfeldt, O. Review of Ziegler's critical edition of Jeremiah in TLZ 83 (1958), 22-24.
- Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, Stuttgart, 1968/69.
- Elliott, J.K. ed. Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his sixty-fifth Birthday (NovTSup 44), Leiden, 1976.
- Epp, E.J. "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism", JBL 93 (1974), 386-414.
- Idem, "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?" HTR 69 (1976), 211-257.
- Idem, "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant', in Studies in New Testament Language and Text (FS George D. Kilpatrick), ed. J.K. Elliott (NovTSup 44), Leiden, 1976, pp. 153-173.
- Faulhaber, M. Die Propheten-Catenen nach römischen Handschriften (Bibl. Studien IV, 2-3), Freiburg in Breslau, 1889.
- Field, F. Origenes Hexaplorum quae supersunt . . . fragmenta, 2 volumes, Oxford, 1875.
- Frankl, P.F. "Studien über die Septuaginta und Peschito zu Jeremia", Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums 21 (1872), 444-456, 497-509, 545-557.
- Freedman, D.N. "The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography", Textus 2, 87-102 (= QHB, pp. 196-211).
- Fritsch, C.T. "The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs", JBL 72 (1953), 169-181 (= Jellicoe, Studies, pp. 356-368).

- Gard, D.H. The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job (JBL Monograph Series 8), Philadelphia, 1952.
- Gehman, H.S. "Some Types of Errors of Transmission in the LXX", VT 3 (1953), 397-400.
- Gelin, A. "Jérémie", Supplement à Dictionnaire de la Bible, IV, 1949, cols. 857-889.
- Gerhardsson, B. Memory and Manuscript, Uppsala, 1961.
- Ghisler, M. In Ieremiam Prophetam Commentarii, Vols. 1-3, Lugundi, 1623.
- Giesebrecht, F. Das Buch Jeremia (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 3,2), 1894² 1907.
- Gooding, D.W. The Greek Deuteronomy, unpublished thesis, Cambridge, 1954.
- Idem, Recensions of the LXX Pentateuch, London, 1955.
- Idem, The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus (Texts and Studies 6) Cambridge, 1959.
- Idem, "An Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament", JSS 21 (1976), 15-25.
- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism: The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint", Textus 3 (1963), 130-158.
- Idem, The Book of Isaiah: Sample Edition with Introduction, Jerusalem, 1965.
- Grabe, J.E. et al. Septuaginta Interpretum, Vols. 1-4, 1707-20.
- Graf, K.H. Der Prophet Jeremia, Leipzig, 1862.
- Gray, G.B. "The Greek Version of Isaiah: Is it the Work of a Single Translator", JTS 12 (1911), 286-293.
- Grossouw, W. The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets: A Contribution to the Study of the Septuagint (Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica, 3), Rome, 1938.
- Gurney, O.R. "The Sultantepe Tablets. VII. The Myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal", AS 10 (1960), 105-31.
- Hanhart, R. "L'edizione dei LXX e la fondazione Gottingense che la prepara". RivStorLettRel 1 (1965), 351-352.
- Hasel, G.F. Review of Janzen's book, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 1973, in Bibliotheca Orientalis, 32 (1975), 236-238.

- Hastoupis, A.P. The Septuagint Text of the Book of Jeremiah (Chs. 1 to 25). Unpublished thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1950.
- Hatch, E. and Redpath, H.A. A Concordance to the Septuagint, Oxford, 1897 (reprinted Graz-Austria, 1954).
- Herrmann, J. and Baumhörtel, F. Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta, (BWAT 5), Stuttgart, 1923.
- Hitzig, F. Der Prophet Jeremia (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 3) Leipzig, 1841, ²1866.
- Holladay, W.L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramic Lexicon of the Old Testament, Leiden, 1971.
- Holmes, R. and Parsons, J. Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus, Vols. 1-5, Oxford, 1798-1827.
- Howard, G. "Some Notes on the Septuagint of Amos", VT 20 (1970), 108-112.
- Hurwitz, M.S. "The Septuagint of Isaiah 36-39 in Relation to that of 1-35, 40-66", HUCA 28 (1957), 75-83.
- Janzen, J.G. "Double Readings in the Text of Jeremiah", HTR 60 (1967), 433-477.
- Idem, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah (HSM 6) Cambridge, Mass., 1973.
- Jellicoe, S. The Septuagint and Modern Study, Oxford, 1968.
- Idem, ed. Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions and Interpretations (Library of Biblical Studies), New York, 1974.
- Johnson, A.C., Gehman, H.S., and Kase, E.H. The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel (Princeton University Studies in Papyrology 3), Princeton, 1938.
- Johnson, B. Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta (Studia Theologica Lundensia 22), Lund, 1963.
- Kahle, P.E. The Cairo Geniza, Oxford, ²1959.
- Idem, "The Greek Bible Manuscripts Used by Origen", JBL 79 (1960), 111-118.
- Kaminka, A. Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der Zwölf Kleinen Prophetenbücher, Frankfurt, 1928.
- Kappler, W. "Ziele und Aufgaben des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens", GGA 202 (1940), 115-124.
- Katz, P. "Frühe hebraisierende Rezensionen der Septuaginta und die Hexapla", ZAW 69 (1957), 77-84.

- Kautzsch, E. and Cowley, A.E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, Oxford, ²1910.
- Kedar-Kopfstein, B. "Textual Gleanings from the Vulgate to Jeremiah", Textus 7 (1969), 36-58.
- Keil, C.F. The Prophecies of Jeremiah, 2 vols., trans. D. Patrick, Edinburgh, 1880.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. Review of the Göttingen editions of 2 and 3 Maccabees and R. Hanhart's Zum Text des 2 und 3 Makkabäerbuches in GGA 215 (1963), 10-22.
- Kittel, R. and Kahle, P. Biblia Hebraica, Stuttgart, ³1966.
- Klein, M.L. "Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique", Biblica 57 (1976), 515-537.
- Klein, R.W. Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint after Qumran (Guides to Biblical Scholarship), Philadelphia, 1974.
- Idem, Review of Janzen's book, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 1973, in CBQ 38 (1976), 109-110.
- Kneucker, J.J. Das Buch Baruch, Leipzig, 1879.
- Kuenan, A. Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1892.
- Kühl, E. Das Verhältnis der Massora zur Septuaginta im Jeremia, Halle, 1882.
- Kühler, L. "Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griechischen Text von Jeremia Kap. 1-9", ZAW 29 (1909), 1-39.
- de Lagarde, Paul Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien, Leipzig, 1863 (Brief summary in Mittheilungen I, 19-26).
- Idem, Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen Übersetzung des alten Testaments, Göttingen, 1882 (Brief summary in Mittheilungen, I, 122-123).
- Idem, Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior Græce, Göttingen, 1883.
- Idem, Mittheilungen, 4 volumes, Göttingen, 1884-91.
- Idem, "Noch einmal meine Ausgabe der Septuaginta", (Mittheilungen III, 1889, 229-256).
- Lambert, G. Review of Ziegler's critical edition of Jeremiah in Nouvelle Revue Theologique 80 (1958), 990.
- Lambert, W.G. and Millard, A.R. Atra-ḥasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood, Oxford, 1969.

- Lemke, W.E. "Nebuchadrezzar, my Servant", CBQ 28 (1966), 45-50.
- Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., A Greek-English Lexicon, revised by H.S. Jones, Oxford, 1940.
- Maas, P. Textual Criticism, translated by Barbara Flower, Oxford, 1958.
- Mandelkern, S. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae, edited by F. Margolis 1937 (reprinted Graz-Austria, 1955).
- Margolis, M.L. "The Aldina as a Source for the 'Sixtine'", JBL 38 (1919), 51-52.
- Idem, "The Textual Criticism of the Greek Old Testament", Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 67 (1928), 187-197.
- Martin, R.A. The Syntax of the Greek of Jeremiah, Part I: The Noun, Pronouns and Prepositions in their Case Constructions, Unpublished thesis, Princeton, 1957.
- Mayser, E. Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, Berlin/Leipzig, 1926-1938.
- McKane, W. Review of Janzen's book, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 1973, in SOTS Book List, 1975, pp. 35-36.
- Metzger, B.M. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, Oxford, 1968.
- Millard, A.R. "Literary History: The Gilgamesh Epic and the Flood", unpublished paper read to the Old Testament Study Group of the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research, Cambridge, July, 1976.
- Milne, H.J.M. and Skeat, T.C. Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus, London, 1938.
- Min, Y-J. The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins. Unpublished thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1977.
- Moore, G.F. "The Antiochian Recension of the Septuagint", The American Journal of Semitic Languages 29 (1912-13), 37-62.
- Movers, F.C. De utriusque recensiois vaticiniorum Ieremiae, Hamburg, 1837.
- Mowinckel, S. Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia, (Videnskabs-selskapets Skrifter, II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1913, No. 5) Kristiana, 1914.
- Muraoka, T. "Is the Septuagint Amos VIII 12 - IX 10 a Separate Unit?" VT 20 (1970), 496-500.

- Idem, "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?", 1972 Proceedings (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 2), ed. R.A. Kraft, Missoula, Montana, 1972, pp. 90-107.
- Idem, "Literary Device in the Septuagint", Textus 8 (1973), 20-30.
- Idem, "A Re-examination of the Two-translator Theory of a Septuagint Book", unpublished paper read at the International Congress for OT Studies, Uppsala, 1971.
- Idem, Review of P. Walters' The Text of the Septuagint, 1973, in JSS 19 (1974), 305-309.
- Nestle, Eb. Das Buch Jeremia griechisch und hebräisch (Nach dem Tode des Herausgebers besorgt von J. Dahse und Erwin Nestle), Stuttgart, 1924.
- das Neves, J.C.M. A teologia da tradução grega dos Setenta no livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías), Lisbon, 1973.
- Nicholson, E.W. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah (The Cambridge Bible Commentary), 2 vols., 1973-75.
- O'Connell K.G. Review of R. Hanhart's Esdrae liber I, Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches, and J.W. Wevers Genesis and Text History of the Greek Genesis in CBQ 39 (1977), 119-125.
- Idem, The Theodotonic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament Greek (HSM 3), Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Book of Amos, Cambridge, 1902.
- The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version: General Preface, Leiden, 1972.
- von Orelli, C. The Prophecies of Jeremiah, trans. J.S. Banks, Edinburgh, 1889.
- Orlinsky, H.M. "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies", JAOS 61 (1941), 81-91.
- Idem, "The Septuagint: Its Use in Textual Criticism", BA 9 (1946), 21-34.
- Ottley, R.R. The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex A), 2 vols., London/Cambridge, 1904-06.
- Idem, Handbook to the Septuagint, London, 1920.
- Overholt, T.W. "King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition", CBQ 30 (1968), 39-48.

- Parker, D. "The Development of Textual Criticism since B.H. Streeter", NTS 24 (1977), 149-162.
- Phrynicius, A. Eclogae nominum et verborum Atticorum, ed. C.A. Lobeck, Leipzig, 1820.
- Rahlfs, A. Septuaginta-Studien I-III, Göttingen, 1904-11.
- Idem, "Die Abhängigkeit der sixtinischen Septuaginta-Ausgabe von der aldinischen", ZAW 33 (1913), 30-46.
- Idem, Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments (MSU 2), Berlin, 1914.
- Idem, Septuaginta, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1935.
- Redpath, H.A. "Contributions Towards Settling the Date of the Translation of the Various Books of the Septuagint", JTS 7 (1906), 606-615.
- Reider, J. and Turner, N. An Index to Aquila (SupVT 12), Leiden, 1966.
- Rendorff, R. "Zum Gebrauch der Formel n^e'um jahwe in Jeremiabuch", ZAW 66 (1954), 27-37.
- Review of Janzen's book, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 1973, RB 81 (1974), 631, initialed F.L.
- Rudolph, W. "Zum Text des Jeremia", ZAW 7 (1930), 272-286.
- Idem, Jeremia (HAT 12), Tübingen, ³1968.
- dos Santos, E.C. An Expanded Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint, Jerusalem, n.d.
- Schleusner, J.F. Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus sive Lexicon in LXX, London, 1829.
- Schmidt, D. "Servant-Sensitivity in the LXX of Jeremiah: A Significant Translation Pattern", IOSCS Bulletin 8 (1975), 17-18.
- Schneider, H. Review of Ziegler's critical edition of Jeremiah in TRe 65 (1960), 101-106.
- Scholz, A. Der masorethische Text und die Septuaginta Übersetzung des Buches Jeremias, Regensburg, 1875.
- Schulz, C. De Ieremiae textus hebraici masorethici et graeci Alexandrini discrepantica, Treptow, 1861.
- Seeligmann, I.L. The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems (Mededelingen en Verhandlingen No 9 van het Vooraziatisch-egyptisch genootschap "ex oriente Lux") Leiden, 1948.

Idem, "Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint", VT 11 (1961), 201-221.

van Selms, A. "Telescoped Discussion as a Literary Device in Jeremiah" VT 26 (1976), 99-112.

The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament (with an English Translation by Sir Launcelot Lee Brenton), published by Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., London, n.d.

Soisalon-Soininen, I. Der Charakter der asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta (AASF B, 114), Helsinki, 1959.

Spohn, M.G.L. Ieremias Vates e versione Ioudaeorum Alexandrinorum ac reliquorum interpretum graecorum emendatus notisque critics illustratus, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1824 ("Tomus 2 post obitum patris edidit, F.G.A. Spohn").

Stone, M.E. "The Old Armenian Version of Isaiah: Towards the Choice of the Base Text for an Edition", Textus 8 (1973), 107-23.

Streane, A.W. The Double Text of Jeremiah, Cambridge, 1896.

Streeter, B.H. The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, London, 1936.

Strungnell, J. "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament", CBQ 36 (1974), 543-58.

Stuart, D.K. Studies in Early Hebrew Meter (Harvard Semitic Monograph 13), Missoula, Montana, 1976.

Swete, H.B. The Old Testament in Greek, 3 vols., 1887-1894.

Idem, ²An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Cambridge, 1902.

Thackeray, H.St.J. "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 4 (1902-03), 398-411.

Idem, "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah", JTS 4 (1902-03), 245-266.

Idem, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books", JTS 4 (1902-03), 578-585.

Idem, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings", JTS 8 (1906-07), 262-278.

Idem, "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS", JTS 9 (1907-08), 88-98 (= Jellicoe, Studies, pp. 459-469).

Idem, "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX", JTS 9 (1907-08), 597-601.

- Idem, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint, Cambridge, 1909.
- Idem, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins (Schweich Lectures, 1920), London, 1921.
- Idem, "Septuagint", ISBE, 1939, pp. 2722-2732.
- Tigay, J.H. Literary-Critical Studies in the Gilgamesh Epic: An Assyriological Contribution to Biblical Literary Criticism, unpublished thesis, Yale, 1971.
- Tischendorf, C. Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes, ed. Eb. Nestle, Leipzig, 1887.
- Tournay, R. Review of Ziegler's critical edition of Jeremiah in RB 65 (1958), 292.
- Tov, E. "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie", RB 79 (1972), 189-199.
- Idem, "On 'Pseudo-Variants' Reflected in the Septuagint", JSS 20 (1975), 165-177.
- Idem, The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8 (HSM 8), Missoula, Montana, 1976.
- Idem, "The Nature of the Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX: A Survey of the Problems", JSOT 7 (1978), 53-68.
- Turner, N. "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 7 (1956), 12-24.
- Turner, P.D.M. "Unravelling the Internal History of the Septuagint: A New Method Exemplified", paper read at OT Seminar, Cambridge University, February, 1977.
- Idem, "ANOIKODOMEIN and Intra-Septuagintal Borrowing", VT 27 (1977), 492-493.
- Vaccari, A. "The Hesychian Recension of the Septuagint", Biblica 46 (1965), 60-66 (= Jellicoe, Studies, pp. 336-342).
- Volz, P. Studien zum Text des Jeremia (BWAT 25), Leipzig, 1920.
- Wahl, O. Die Prophetenzitate der Sacra Parallela in ihren Verhältnissen zur Septuaginta-Textüberlieferung, 2 vols. (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 13), Munich, 1965.
- Walters (formerly Katz), P. The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation, ed. D.W. Gooding, Cambridge, 1973.
- Weippert, H. Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches (BZAW 132), Berlin/New York, 1973.

- Weiser, A. Das Buch des Propheten Jeremia (Das Alte Testament Deutsch 20/21), Göttingen, 1960.
- Wellhausen, J. Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, Göttingen, 1871.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. Review of Janzen's book, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah, 1973, in JJS 28 (1973), 198.
- Wevers, J.W. "A Study in the Textual History of the Codex Vaticanus in the Books of Kings", ZAW 64 (1952), 178-189.
- Idem, "The Göttingen Septuagint", IOSCS Bulletin 8 (1975), 19-23.
- Idem, Genesis (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum 1), Göttingen, 1974.
- Idem, Deuteronomium (Septuaginta: VT Graecum. Auc. Aca. Scie. Gott. Ed. 3,2), Göttingen, 1977.
- Wichelhaus, J. De Ieremiae versione alexandrina, Halle, 1847.
- Wiles, M.F. "Origen as a Biblical Scholar", CHB I, pp. 454-489.
- Wiseman, D.J. "Israel's Literary Neighbours in the 13th Century B.C.", Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages 5 (1977), 77-91.
- Wolff, C. Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum (TU 118), Berlin, 1976.
- Workman, G.C. The Text of Jeremiah, Edinburgh, 1889.
- Wright, G.E. ed. The Bible and the Ancient Near East, London, 1961.
- Würthwein, E. Der Text des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica, Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, 1966.
- Wutz, F. Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus (BWAT 9), Stuttgart, 1925-33).
- Zevit, Z. "The Use of תַּיָּד as a Diplomatic Term in Jeremiah", JBL 88 (1969), 74-77.
- Ziegler, J. Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12,3), Münster, 1934.
- Idem, Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch (Beilage zum Vorlesungsverzeichnis der staatlichen Akademie zu Braunschweig), 1934-35 (= Sylloge, pp. 29-42).
- Idem, "Der Text der Aldina im Dodekapropheten", Biblica 26 (1945), 37-51 (= Sylloge, pp. 306-320).
- Idem, "Die Septuaginta Hieronymi im Buch des Propheten Jeremias", in Colligere Fragmenta (FS Alban Dold), ed. B. Fischer and V. Fiala (Texte und Arbeiten 2), Beuron, 1952, pp. 13-24 (= Sylloge, 345-356).

- Idem, "Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta", Biblica 34 (1953), 435-455 (= Sylloge, 394-414).
- Idem, "Jeremias-Zitate in Väter-Schriften", Historisches Jahrbuch 77 (1958), 347-357 (= Sylloge, pp. 439-449).
- Idem, Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta (NAWG, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 2; MSU 6), Göttingen, 1958.
- Idem, Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta, (MSU 10), Göttingen, 1971.
- Idem, Isaias (Septuaginta: VT Graecum. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis Editum 14), Göttingen, 1939.
- Idem, Duodecim Prophetæ (Septuaginta: VT Graecum. Auc. Soc. Litt. Gott. Ed. 13), Göttingen, 1943.
- Idem, Ezechiel (Septuaginta: VT Graecum. Auc. Soc. Litt. Gott. Ed. 16,1), Göttingen, 1952.
- Idem, Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae (Septuaginta: VT Graecum. Auc. Aca. Scie. Gott. Ed. 15), Göttingen, 1957, 21976.
- Zuntz, G. "Der Antinoe Papyrus der Proverbia und das Prophetologion", ZAW 68 (1956), 124-184.